

THE
SATURDAY REVIEW
OF
POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 750, Vol. 29.

March 12, 1870.

PRICE 6d.
STAMPED 7d.

THE DEBATE.

THAT the debate has been very dull is universally admitted. It has been so dull that members began to speculate why it was so dull, and a Conservative member traced the mischief to the Bill being so moderate that the Opposition could find no substantial objection to it. It was so dull that any joke was clutched at, and the House was convulsed at the oddity of a poor boy having a grandmother. But, if dull, it has been sensible and to the point, and has settled that the Irish Land Bill, with some, perhaps with many, modifications, is to become law. The speech of Sir ROUNDELL PALMER embodied all that moderate English politicians have to say about the Bill. It is great enough to escape being weak and unmeaning, while it is not in any sense revolutionary. The system prevailing in England is a better system, for it is founded on the principles of free contract; but the system now to be introduced into Ireland is a necessary concession to the comparative rudeness and ignorance of the people. Dr. BALL had implored the House not to treat his countrymen as babies, as beings inferior to Scotchmen and Englishmen, and as incapable of contracting fairly and freely. The answer given by Sir ROUNDELL PALMER is the only answer that can be given, that the Irish are incapable of contracting fairly and freely. Sufficient experience shows it, just as sufficient experience shows that Irishmen will submit to a reign of terror in helpless inactivity unless Government comes to their rescue. Mr. LOWE only so lately as two years ago expressed an opinion that what was good for England must be good for Ireland, and that political economy must be true everywhere. He has been twitted with his opinions by several members of the Opposition, and they are entitled to the pleasure arising from the discovery that the most pitiless logician will sometimes abandon his logic, just as it was found that the determined enemy of treaties of commerce had consented to a new commercial treaty with Austria. But the Opposition in accepting the second reading of the Bill have virtually recognised, just as much as Mr. LOWE has done, that in Ireland some limitation on freedom of contract must be imposed in the hope that peace may be secured, and the tender plant of free contract gradually fostered and strengthened. But Sir ROUNDELL PALMER was most explicit in stating that in voting for the Second Reading he did so on the express understanding that the Government would now proceed to protect life and property in Ireland. The two things are to go together. England has looked on patiently at deeds of blood and violence, at the murder of innocent people, at the intimidation of thousands of quiet, peaceful, loyal subjects, because the Government said that a fixed epoch would arrive when the willingness of Parliament to do everything it could to allay agrarian irritation would be proclaimed to the world. This fixed epoch has now come. The Bill has been read a second time, and now the shelter of the law must once more be thrown over unoffending men and women. The pledge of the Government now has to be redeemed, and it is indisputable that the House will require, before it goes into Committee, that the stipulated protection should be afforded to persons who ask nothing more than that they should pursue the ordinary avocations of life without being shot.

It is natural to turn to the speech of Mr. HARDY, to learn the true views of the most determined and consistent section of the Opposition. He would evidently have been very much pleased to object to the Second Reading if he had seen his way to do so, for it is obviously opposed to all the principles of dealing with Ireland which he has always advocated. His speech was therefore the speech of a man who has to accept, and to accept without open disapproval, of that which it is obvious he totally dislikes. Much of what

he said was necessarily confined to the criticism of details, but he also dwelt on one or two subjects of general interest. He tried to show that the Irish landlords had been maligned, and had been represented as harsh, capricious, and vexatious towards their tenants, whereas they had for the most part been kind, easy, and considerate with them. Lord BURKE had previously gone over the same ground with a natural wish to set public opinion right on a matter that intimately concerned himself, his family, and his friends. There can be no doubt that Irish landlords have often been indulgent, and not seldom too indulgent, in old days to their tenants, that many of them are kind, goodnatured, and easy at the present day, and that evictions are not numerically important nor based, except with the rarest exceptions, on mere caprice. But if this is true, two other things are equally true. In the first place, as the SOLICITOR-GENERAL for Ireland pointed out, there has been a long string of Bills passed in favour of the landlord, giving increased stringency to his legal powers over his tenant, and enabling him to threaten more effectually even when he did not strike. The landlords have used their influence with the Imperial Parliament to get legislative advantage after advantage over the tenant. They may not have used these advantages very freely, but why did they seek them? Why did they get Parliament to make their power greater, except that, if they liked to strike, they might strike swiftly and surely? In the next place, the landlords have managed to inspire the feeling of insecurity in the class of small tenants. This is a fact to which every recent inquirer has borne testimony. The tenants, rightly or wrongly, have lost the hope, if they ever had it, that they would derive a fair proportion of the benefit if they improved the soil. It is of no great use discussing whether they have had good reason for their belief. They have believed that all landlords could, and that many would, turn them out penniless if it would pay to do so; and it does not remedy or alleviate this state of things that a great many landowners have always behaved very well. Sir JOHN GRAY adduced some instances of the despotism of landlords which are startling enough. Petty tyranny could scarcely go further. Let us assume these to be mere exceptions. All that can be said is, that the Irish people have been more terrified by the exceptions than comforted by the rule. What Parliament has now to do is to allay, if it can, a panic which, we confess, in spite of the incontestable virtues of many landlords, seems to us by no means unreasonable.

Mr. HARDY also urged numerous objections which might be fairly urged against the Bill if it was supposed that the general law would not be called into play to support its provisions. He suggested that even after it was passed there would be abundance of dissatisfied persons in Ireland. There would still be persons who wished for farms, and could not get them; there would still be persons who thought that large pasture-farms should be cut up into numerous small arable-farms, in order to accommodate more tenants; there would still be persons clamouring that Ireland belonged to the Irish, and anxious to drive Scotch and English farmers out of the country. This is very probably true, and the only argument is that these persons must be taught that they are not going to get what they want; that the law will protect grazing farmers, and Scotch and English farmers, against Irishmen and every one else. Undoubtedly the success of the Bill entirely depends on the assumption that persons who commit crimes because the Bill does not give them all they want will be most severely and certainly punished. When this is once assumed, we may approach the details of the Bill; and the numerous speakers who discussed these details made it at least evident what are the points that will be most keenly debated or contested in Committee. There was

a most remarkable difference of opinion as to Ulster Tenant-Right. It was said that the Bill ought to define what it was; and, in reply, the SOLICITOR-GENERAL for Ireland stated that he was acquainted with nine definitions of it. It was spoken of as a great blessing, which all Ireland ought to share, and a great evil, for the extinction of which Parliament ought to provide. The House has evidently got to hear much more about it before it can see its way to dealing practically with a subject which wears such different appearances to different minds. It will also be a topic of very considerable interest whether the landlord should have to prove that improvements claimed by the tenant were in fact made by the landlord's predecessor. Mr. HARDY drew attention to the hardship this would inflict on purchasers under the Encumbered Estates Act, who cannot know or show what was done before their time; and this is so true, that the only answer to it, if there is one, is that every general rule must cause hardship in some instances, and that on the whole the rule throwing the burden of proof on the landlord will cause the least hardship. Lastly, it is plain that a very warm conflict will take place over the proposal of the Government to draw a sharp line in calculating compensation between evictions for non-payment of rent and evictions for other causes. On the one hand, it was urged that the non-payment of rent might be due to some great Providential affliction, such as cattle disease, and that a tenant evicted for not paying his rent under such circumstances ought not to lose his fair amount of compensation. On the other hand, Mr. HENLEY suggested that a landlord might have quite as good reasons for evicting a tenant as non-payment of rent could be. The tenant might have killed a fox or a landlord, and if he did such horrible things, he ought not to be better off in point of compensation than if he had not paid his rent. That there are serious difficulties of this sort to be settled and overcome in the framework of the Bill is not to be denied, but if the present desire of all parties to get the Bill passed continues, these difficulties will easily be got rid of.

NEW ZEALAND AND THE HOME GOVERNMENT.

THE debate in the House of Lords on the affairs of New Zealand will probably close the controversy. The merits of the Government policy are still open to question, but the withdrawal of the troops may now be considered as final and irrevocable. Lord GRANVILLE had no difficulty in showing that he had only adhered to the decisions of his predecessors, for the Duke of NEWCASTLE, Mr. CARDWELL, Lord CARNARVON, and the Duke of BUCKINGHAM had repeatedly declined to allow the English garrison to remain permanently in the islands. The proposal that the exclusive conduct of native wars should be undertaken by the colonists originally proceeded from the New Zealand Assembly and Ministry, who probably intended only to express in a forcible manner their dissatisfaction with the management of a recent campaign. The inconvenience of introducing temper into public communications was severely felt when the Duke of NEWCASTLE answered the application by taking the colonists at their word. From that time to the present many volumes of New Zealand Correspondence have been filled with complaints of the harshness of the Imperial Government, and with recriminations from home. It was unfortunate that the withdrawal of the troops, which might have been sufficiently defended on grounds of general expediency, should have been officially justified by reference to the hasty offer of the colonial Parliament. There is no advantage in reminding a friendly opponent that he is bound by his own inadvertent language. If it had been right and convenient that half a dozen English regiments should be quartered in New Zealand, it mattered little whether an ephemeral Ministry or majority had expressed an opposite opinion. For a considerable time the main controversy was complicated by a supplementary dispute on the relations of the military force, as long as it remained in the colony, to the local Government. Sir GEORGE GREY bitterly complained that, notwithstanding his titular right over the troops, the General in command would never recognise his superior authority, nor would either the Colonial Office or the Horse Guards interfere to redress his grievance. When responsible government was conceded to the colonies little care was taken to anticipate the inevitable consequences of the change. It was entirely unreasonable that a Minister representing the temporary majority of the colonial Parliament should exercise control over the movements of Imperial troops; and a Governor reduced to the functions of a constitutional King, although he still bore the title of Captain-General or Commander-in-Chief, had already become

the mouthpiece of his Ministers. On the other hand, it seemed inconvenient that a colonial Government engaged in a war should not be able to employ the principal force which was nominally at its disposal, according to its own judgment of the necessities of the service. The conflict of authority furnished another reason for the withdrawal of the garrison, and, whatever may be the wishes of the people of New Zealand, the issue in England is now confined to the opportuneness of the final evacuation. Lord CARNARVON, in his appeal to the Government, only desired that the 18th Regiment should remain in the islands till the termination of the war.

The arguments for delay deserve careful attention, for, although the language and policy of the colonists have from time to time varied, there is no uncertainty as to their present wishes nor any doubt of their entire good faith. While they profess their willingness to undertake the burden of any military operations which may be necessary, they allege that native disaffection would be encouraged by the disappearance from the islands of the last force which serves under the Imperial flag. Two Commissioners have been sent to England with full authority to make arrangements for the payment of the troops by the colony, and the Assembly has voted a considerable sum for military purposes. The strongest reason against a concession which would gratify the colony while it would cost nothing to the Imperial Treasury is founded on the difficulty of making English soldiers passive spectators of a possible conflict. Although stringent orders might be issued from home, it would be difficult for the commander of an English regiment to keep his men in quarters when a colonial force might perhaps be pressed by superior numbers. In a Border ballad the Scotch champion who has slain his own adversary in a combat of three to three declares that his comrades who are still engaged shall get no help from him, but as soon as he sees that one of them is getting the worse in the conflict he instantly revokes his promise and strikes down a second enemy. An English colonel would be likely to reason in the same way; and if he abided strictly by his orders to remain neutral, he would inevitably incur universal odium, which would extend to the Home Government. At present there is fortunately no immediate need of Imperial assistance, as the war is apparently concluded, yet it may be doubted whether Lord GRANVILLE would not have acted more wisely in complying with the earnest request of the colonists. It would not have been necessary to reverse a policy deliberately adopted, for after two or three years of tranquillity the colony would have gladly relieved itself of the subsidy for the maintenance of the regiment. A concession would have been gratefully accepted although it might have had little intrinsic value, and Lord GRANVILLE owes some amends to the people of New Zealand for more than one irritating communication. He is perhaps by this time aware that, even if he had not mistaken the facts, his assertion that the first settlers had colonized the islands without the sanction of the Government was entirely irrelevant. His advice that all encroachments on native rights should, after the lapse of several years, be withdrawn, was probably impracticable. The despatches which have been so often and so justly criticized seemed to be inspired by the artificial acrimony of a writer who was resolved to guard against his own habitual propensity to courtesy and kindness. Even if all Lord GRANVILLE's arguments had been unanswerable, it is useless to attempt to convince a community that it has been guilty of folly and of injustice. Substantial firmness ought proverbially to be combined with gentleness of manner. Lord CARNARVON justly observes that Lord GRANVILLE's refusal to guarantee a loan was made in an unusual form. Instead of simply rejecting the proposal, he communicated the application for a guarantee to the Treasury without stating any opinion of his own. It is not the custom of the Treasury to make grants of money or credit which are not recommended by the proper department; yet Lord GRANVILLE in his despatch cited the refusal of the Treasury as an authority for his own decision to the same effect.

It is not surprising that Lord CARNARVON should have commented on an ambiguous suggestion that the New Zealand Government should recognise the Maori King. It is perfectly true that, as Lord GRANVILLE afterwards explained, a barbarous chief may in New Zealand, as on the African coast, be called a king without ceasing to be a dependent. There are dozens of Maharajahs in India more or less subject to English sovereignty, of whom several are only titular princes or nobles; but the Maori King and his adherents desire above all things to assert their independence, and they would interpret any recognition of the title as an admission of their claims. It seems that the proposal was first made in a semi-official

despatch by Sir G. BOWEN, who may or may not have anticipated the limitations which are explained by Lord GRANVILLE. The same functionary, when he was Secretary to the Lord High Commissioner of the Ionian Islands, caused much disturbance by advising the Government, in violation of existing rights and treaties, to abandon the rest of the Septinsular Republic and to seize Corfu as an English possession. The local Government will be able to judge of the expediency of treating for any purpose with the so-called Maori King. Lord GRANVILLE was perhaps not previously aware that the king's title and authority are not recognised by some of the native tribes. A recommendation that his rank should be in any manner acknowledged ought to have been carefully guarded. It is satisfactory to find that in the recent debate Lord GRANVILLE exchanged the didactic austerity which he had displayed in his despatches for a more natural and conciliatory tone. A Ministry which by thoughtless language provoked disaffection in the thoroughly English settlement of New Zealand would not be readily pardoned.

The value of Lord GREY's objections to the colonial system adopted by several successive Governments is rather historical than political. It may be admitted that responsible government was conceded with little deliberation at the time, although it had long been contemplated by speculative politicians. It is possible that in some cases a longer period of dependence would have been advantageous to the colonies, although it would have been burdensome, if not dangerous, to the Imperial Government. If the bond of authority had not been voluntarily relaxed, it would have yielded to pressure as soon as any serious difference of opinion arose between any important colony and the Imperial Government; but it is idle to guess at the results of contingencies which have not occurred, and it is also a waste of time to inquire whether a decision might have been postponed which can assuredly never be reversed. It is barely possible that during the panic of last year the people of New Zealand might have submitted to some degree of Imperial control in consideration of effective aid against the native insurgents; but, when the terms of an arrangement came to be discussed in detail, there would have been almost insuperable difficulty in defining the conditions of dependence. It is still more certain that, when the crisis was over, the people of the colony would have demanded the restoration of their independence. Plausible arguments may be used to prove that the Imperial Government ought to have reserved to itself the duty and power of protecting the native inhabitants of New Zealand; but the division of authority, when it existed for a time, was found intolerably inconvenient. It might perhaps not have been for the interest of the Maoris themselves to depend on the protection of an authority which exercised no direct control over the English settlers; but it is a more conclusive objection to the supposed arrangement that it would never have worked in practice. The taxpayer at home would have with good reason objected to provide funds for one branch of colonial government; and, on the other hand, the New Zealand Parliament would have claimed a supervision over the expenditure of any portion of their own revenue. Lord GREY is not in the habit of changing his opinion, and it is unnecessary to inquire whether he is and has been in the right. Few ever of his contemporaries will fail to regard with satisfaction the vast diminution of anxiety and responsibility which has been attained by the emancipation of the colonies.

THE END OF THE DUAL GOVERNMENT.

AT last! The Dual Government of the Army is under sentence of death, and if the recommendations of Lord NORTHBROOK's Committee are honestly worked out, the office of Commander-in-Chief will become what it ought always to have been, a mere departmental office placed side by side with the departments of Control and Finance, under the common direction of the Secretary of State and his permanent Under-Secretary. We have struggled so long and so patiently for this grand reform that we are not at all disposed to cavil at the little devices by which the importance of the proposed measures has been sought to be disguised. The change will be a revolution in the administration of the Commander-in-Chief, but one that, by relieving him of indefinite duties of interposing in matters properly belonging to other departments, will enormously increase the efficiency, and therefore the dignity, of the office. And it is very satisfactory to find, from the evidence of the Duke of CAMBRIDGE, how completely His ROYAL HIGHNESS recognises and how frankly he accepts the broad principle of this sweeping reform.

We postponed all observation on Mr. CARDWELL's myste-

rious utterances before the appearance of the Reports of his Committee, in the full conviction that behind the rounded periods of the Minister a really great work was going on; and we have not been disappointed. There is very much in the scheme of the Committee which invites criticism, but its outline is so broad and its basis so sound that we shall for the present defer all consideration of details. The cardinal point was to get rid of the duality between the War Office and the Horse Guards, both in principle and practice, and we shall not quarrel with the result because Mr. CARDWELL curiously persists in denying the existence of the abuse which he proposes to eradicate. In principle the Dual Government was as effectually smitten by the Minister's public declaration that the QUEEN's Warrant which sanctioned it was mere waste paper, and that this view was concurred in by the Field-Marshal Commanding in Chief, as if the more constitutional course had been pursued of revoking the Royal Warrant by another instrument emanating from HER MAJESTY. Perhaps this is the first time that the undoubted prerogative of the Crown has been narrowed by the verbal statement of a Minister that the Royal signature to a solemn instrument was a mere nullity. But though a different method might have been more respectful and constitutional, the result is the same, and the principle of duality is dead at last. A nominal change in the principles of administration would of course be idle if the practice were not remodelled in the same sense, and this we rejoice to see will be done if the recommendations of the Committee are followed. Just as it was the cue of the Minister to deny the existence of duality in principle, so he has steadily sought to ignore its existence in practice, and even now no doubt he will try to persuade others, and perhaps himself, that what his Committee propose are only trifling alterations in detail. There is no great harm in these tactics except their childishness. They will not throw dust in the eyes of any one, and they were entirely unnecessary to reconcile the Duke of CAMBRIDGE to what, in common with every other man of administrative capacity, he plainly sees to be an inevitable, and in its broad features a most essential, change. Nothing about the blue-book on which we are commenting is more satisfactory than the evidence of His ROYAL HIGHNESS. In almost every line he shows how fully he understands that the system has been dual, and is to be so no longer; and, subject to certain criticisms in detail, he accepts the position with a frankness which might have been expected, and which augurs well for the future working of the reconstituted War Office.

As we have said, the new scheme leaves the purely military department as completely under the Commander-in-Chief as Supply and Finance are to be under the heads of those branches of administration; and it must soon be found that a thorough departmental control under the Secretary of State over all that appertains to the fighting business will give far more efficiency and power of usefulness than an indefinite and quasi-independent right of checking and remonstrating about the doings of collateral departments. According to the old practice, every detail of Supply was communicated and minuted and corresponded about by two distinct sets of officers, one under the Horse Guards and the other under the War Office. If the clothing officers went wrong, as the Duke of CAMBRIDGE puts it, "even to a button," a separate machinery existed by which the offence became known to the Commander-in-Chief, who considered himself "responsible for everything," and duly interposed to set it right. Practically we gather from the evidence of His ROYAL HIGHNESS that everything which in any way concerned the well-being of the soldier, in barrack accommodation, in clothing, and in supplies of all kinds, was brought to the knowledge of the Commander-in-Chief by a distinct channel, and that it was his duty so to supervise the action of the supply departments at the War Office as to furnish a perpetual check upon them. In short, all the officers who catered in any way for the soldier—which means substantially all the staff of the War Office—were subject to a double check, first through their superiors in Pall Mall, culminating in the Secretary of State, and secondly through a military Staff, which culminated in the Commander-in-Chief. It pleases Mr. CARDWELL to say that this was not dual administration in practice. We do not care what it is called. In fact it was duality; but we are quite content to adopt the famous Cambridge verdict, and acquit Mr. CARDWELL of having ever promoted this mischievous system, on the condition (which seems likely to be fulfilled) that he never does so again. Undoubtedly the old plan had this to recommend it, that there were two sets of eyes to see that the soldier had his due. But then at what frightful cost and complication this

check and countercheck machinery was kept in action comes out plainly enough from all the evidence before the Committee. One can readily understand the shade of reluctance with which the Duke of CAMBRIDGE contemplates the surrender of the protecting care which he exercised over the minutest details affecting the soldier's comfort. But the method of setting one great department to do its own work, and another great department to watch every detail and remonstrate against every error, is radically wrong and monstrously expensive, and in the case of the army had expanded itself into the most extraordinary complication of offices with interlacing and overlapping duties that perhaps was ever constructed. The waste of labour disclosed by the evidence is something appalling, and one is almost provoked into the blasphemy of saying that it would be better that a wrong button should be supplied now and then than that such a duplicated machinery should exhaust the funds and cripple the action of our military authorities. The true way to prevent errors and abuses in any department is by the action of its special chief, aided by a due organization of his subordinate staff, and subject to the general direction of the central authority. The cases, and they must be numerous, in which the action of the Supply department may affect the Military department can always be more effectually dealt with by free communication between the heads of each, and also between their local representatives, than by making the Horse Guards a sort of detective office, as it has been, to find out and expose the errors of the War Office. These are the merest elements of administrative science, and a scheme based upon them cannot fail to work in the hands of competent officers. In other hands no system would work, but it is of the essence of due departmental organization to create in every chief officer the strongest motive to secure efficient subordinates, and a wise Minister will be slow to taint with political patronage or favouritism the supply of officers on whose competency the success of his administration must depend.

We need scarcely add that the Committee have naturally dwelt upon the absolute necessity of bringing the military department under the same roof with the rest of the War Administration. Without this it would be almost impracticable to put the new scheme into working order, and money could not be more economically laid out than in providing a suitable building for the accommodation of the Secretary of State and all his subordinate officers.

THE MALT-TAX.

THE recent debate on the Malt-tax was distinguished from ordinary discussions of the subject by the introduction of a novel proposal. Colonel BARTELOT, who leads the opposition to the duty, candidly admits that 7,000,000*l.* of revenue cannot be spared; and he probably thinks that the reduction of the rate would do comparatively little good to the barley-growers. It is allowed on all hands that a duty on consumption ought, if possible, to be levied on the article in its complete state rather than on the materials of which it is composed. In the case of the Malt-tax the rule is neglected for reasons of practical convenience; and although the revenue officer leaves the raw material untouched, he enforces his claim at the first stage of manufacture, where the barley is sprouted into malt. The ultimate purchaser is therefore compelled to pay interest and profit on the successive advances made by the maltster, the brewer, and the publican. The demand is for the most part levied, like the royalty on English silver coinage, in the form, not of increase of price, but in adulteration of the commodity produced. If there were no Malt-tax, beer would be better as well as cheaper, and a similar result might perhaps partially result from a change in the mode of levying the duty. The obvious remedy of altering the point of incidence of the tax, by transferring it from malt to beer, would make the collection of the revenue more expensive and difficult in proportion to the greater number of brewers as compared to maltsters. It is not desirable to multiply the visits of excisemen to trading premises, and their presence in private houses would be altogether intolerable. It would also be necessary to adapt the amount of the duty to the value or strength of the beer, and the operation of gauging would be troublesome, expensive, and vexatious. It was indeed stated by one of the speakers in the debate that a discriminating duty is levied on beer in Belgium, in Holland, and in some parts of Germany; but a practice which may be but moderately unpopular where it has been long established may be inexpedient or impracticable if it is introduced for the first time. Forty

years ago, when almost everything was subject to the taxes which had been imposed during the war, the Beer duty was, with general assent, selected for abolition, on the ground that it was especially obnoxious. The taxpayer has not in modern times become more patient; and Chancellors of the Exchequer have almost lost Mr. PITT's art of devising new methods of raising money. It is natural that members who are for the moment protesting against the Malt-tax should theoretically prefer any alternative duty which might not be subject to precisely the same objections; and the deputation which a few days ago waited on the CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER concurred in the plan of transferring the burden. Mr. LOWE was apparently not indisposed to listen to the suggestion; yet, if a tax on beer were formally proposed, it would be denounced by all sections of the community, and it would not improbably be rejected by the House of Commons.

While Colonel BARTELOT, in preparation for his motion, was hopelessly endeavouring to devise a substitute for the Malt-duty, his perplexity was suddenly and unexpectedly relieved by the brewers who formed the late deputation to Mr. LOWE, and by Mr. BASS, who supported their demand. The License duty, which was imposed in place of the Hop duty, falls, according to their own probable statement, exclusively on the brewers, for the simple reason that the amount, although collectively large, is too small to be distributed among retail purchasers of beer. It immediately occurred to Colonel BARTELOT that the objection to a tax because it is too small admits of the easy remedy of making it much larger. Beer-drinkers cannot be compelled to pay their share of 400,000*l.*, but 5,000,000*l.* divided by the number of consumers would yield an integral quotient. He therefore proposed to substitute for the Malt-tax a large License duty on brewers, amounting, according to the CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, to 170,000*l.* on Mr. BASS alone. As a still larger sum is probably paid by some persons on account of the Malt-tax, Colonel BARTELOT's suggestion is not devoid of a certain plausibility. If in any case the old and new taxes were equally heavy, the charge would furnish no reason for increasing the price of beer; and the complaint which was lately preferred to Mr. LOWE would no longer have any foundation. As the plan was not seriously discussed, it was not remarked that the distillers as well as the brewers ought to contribute to make good the loss of the revenue from malt. The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, who undertook either to adopt Colonel BARTELOT's own plan or to urge sufficient reasons against it, will probably hereafter show that an enormous License duty on brewers would give an unfair and artificial stimulus to domestic brewing. The same objection was recognised by Mr. GLADSTONE when he repealed the Hop duty, but the amount of the tax was so small, and the proportion paid by private persons would have been so insignificant, that the brewers voluntarily declined the protection which was offered by Mr. GLADSTONE. Notwithstanding the great advantages which they possess, it would be impossible for the brewers to carry on their business in competition with private persons if they were exceptionally weighted with a burden of five or six millions of taxation. At the same time, a duty on every person who brewed at home could not be levied without unbearable interference with domestic arrangements. The Herefordshire riots which have for more than a century secured to cider a proud exemption from excise duties might perhaps be imitated by ordinary householders if they were forced to admit revenue officers into their brewhouses or back-kitchens.

The grievance inflicted by the Malt-tax on certain classes of farmers is not imaginary, though it has sometimes been exaggerated. The occupiers of the best barley-lands find abundant compensation for any restrictions on the agricultural use of malt in the additional security which an artificial increase of price affords to their natural monopoly. The comparative virtue of the finest grain in the brewing-tub is worth a difference of several shillings in the price of the quarter of barley; and the restriction of demand and increase of outlay caused by the tax operate to the disadvantage of inferior qualities. It may be doubted whether any barley in England which has been harvested in good condition would be too worthless for the purpose of brewers; but damaged grain, and in some cases perhaps the produce of bad soils, can be better employed than in the manufacture of questionable beer. Some feeders of stock hold that malt is more nutritious than barley; and it may be assumed that it would be not unfrequently used as food for cattle if it were exempt both from duty and from the consequent supervision of the revenue officer. Some years ago, with the design of silencing, if not of satisfying, the complaint of the farmers, Mr. GLADSTONE allowed an

exemption from duty to malt combined in certain proportions with linseed, and forming a compound which has since been called GLADSTONE'S Mixture. It was intended that the linseed should render the malt useless for brewing; and it is difficult to understand the statement that palatable beer has nevertheless been extracted from the mixture. The real objection to the arrangement is that it necessarily involves liability to excise control, and that farmers are therefore unwilling to try an experiment which might otherwise be found sometimes remunerative. It is impossible to doubt that a duty on any kind of product must cause loss and inconvenience; and there is a special objection to the discouragement of domestic and simple manufactures. The business of financiers is to raise the money which they require with the smallest possible disturbance of industry. If the Malt-tax causes farmers to grow wheat where it would be better to grow barley, or to feed bullocks with something dearer or less suitable than malt, the impost is to that extent mischievous without reference to its intermediate or ultimate incidence on the trader or consumer. There is indeed nothing to be said for it, except that it yields seven millions.

Strong advocates of temperance may perhaps doubt whether it is desirable to cheapen beer; but no Government would be justified in wilfully and capriciously making such a commodity dear. In Bavaria and other parts of Southern Germany the abundance and cheapness of wholesome beer are not found to produce a more demoralizing effect than the similar advantages of wine-producing districts. All classes in those pleasant regions drink much beer, but it is said that they rarely drink too much; and in some degree the bulky character of the beverage offers a mechanical impediment to excess. It is much less trouble to get drunk on gin or whisky than on beer, and the intoxication produced by concentrated alcohol is exceptionally injurious. In the competition between spirits and beer it is not undesirable to encourage the less pernicious fluid; and there is reason to believe that the adulteration of beer is partly caused by the tax which raises its price. Beer-shop keepers, unless they are grossly libelled, habitually poison their customers with drugs which are mixed with the beer for the express purpose of facilitating intoxication and of producing thirst. No change of fiscal laws would altogether reform the practice; but cheapness would diminish the temptation to adulterate liquor; and in some cases the abolition of the Malt-tax might give an impetus to brewing at home. To a change which would benefit both consumers and producers the only objection consists in the difficulty of raising the money with less pressure by any other form of taxation. If the revenue continues to flourish, Mr. LOWE, or one of his successors, will probably try the experiment of reducing the rate of duty. There are objections to a sacrifice of income which would not remove any of the incidental and secondary objections to the tax; and unless the diminution allowed of a reduction of the retail price of beer the whole amount which might be remitted would be intercepted by the brewers. Nevertheless the reduction would be expedient, if it were practicable, inasmuch as it would bring the tax within more manageable dimensions. In the present year Mr. LOWE will have more urgent claimants on his bounty or his justice. The second Abyssinian penny of Income-tax still awaits removal; and it is already announced that the Stamp duties are to be remodelled, and probably to be reduced. It is highly probable that some diminution of the Sugar duties will absorb a considerable part of the surplus; nor would any relief in the taxes on commodities tend more directly to the benefit of the consumer.

THE IRISH MEMBERS ON THE LAND BILL.

THE only merit of the debate on the Land Bill is that the Irish members have had their say. They have been allowed to talk their talk out, and we know what they think and wish and feel. This is a great advantage. Of all the benefits of Parliamentary Government it is perhaps the most conspicuous that those who have a great personal interest in any matter under discussion can get a hearing, and can present their case in the best light they can devise to the public. The amount of support the Bill has received from the Irish members is the best testimony to its substantial merits; but it has met with much criticism and some opposition from them. There were at the outset two members who wished it to be altogether rejected. They said it was so bad that it could never satisfy Ireland, and ought never to satisfy Ireland; and it was natural to look with great interest to see why they thus denounced it. Mr. BRYAN made the following objections to

it—that it did not define what Ulster Tenant Right is, that it allowed eviction under a mere pecuniary penalty, that it permitted a lease to be given in lieu of compensation, and that it placed the labourer at the mercy of the tenant. The Bill does not define Ulster Tenant Right as Mr. BRYAN defined it, because Mr. BRYAN defined that Right as he conceived it ought to be, and the Bill only deals with Ulster Tenant Right as it is. To say that the labourer is placed by the Bill at the mercy of the tenant is simply to proclaim that the tenants are not prepared to mete out to others the justice for which they clamour. The second and third objections undoubtedly go to the real point of difference between the Government and the extreme section of Irish agitators. The Government only seeks to prevent evictions by rendering them unprofitable; their wish, except in case of non-payment of rent or subdivision, is to make them illegal. The seconder of the amendment, Captain WHITE, not only proclaimed that this was the real point at issue, but ventured on enunciating the philosophical theory on which the claim of those opposed to the Government scheme might, as he thought, be properly rested. He acknowledged that, even fenced round by the exceptions in case of non-payment of rent or subdivision, security of tenure, or what is generally called fixity of tenure, might be to hand over one man's property to another; but he was not at all alarmed at this, for he advanced the very remarkable doctrine that this was the proper basis of all land tenure. We have heard in old days that Property is Theft; but it has been reserved to Captain WHITE to conceive that Property properly and legitimately involves a series of thefts. It would only be carrying out the true doctrine if, after the tenants had stolen the land from the landlords, the landlords were in turn to steal it back again from the tenants. Both Mr. BRYAN and Captain WHITE dwelt on what the latter called the almost maniacal competition for land, and Captain WHITE complained that the Bill did not put a stop to the mania. It is true that Mr. GLADSTONE rested his advocacy of the Bill in a large degree on this maniacal competition, but we do not see how fixity of tenure would stop it. The tenant would be allowed to sell his goodwill, and then there would be a maniacal competition for this goodwill. Surely there must be a limit to Irish madness. Mr. BRYAN urged that the landlords would evict small holders, and pay them seven years' rental, because there would be abundance of maniacs willing to give back in the shape of increased rent all that the landlord lost. Either these maniacs could fairly get the increased rent out of the land or they could not. If they could, it would only show that the land thus transferred had been previously underlet to a ridiculous degree. If they could not, and it must be supposed the landlord would be able to judge of this pretty well beforehand, the landlord would simply have paid seven years' rental to one man in order to get into a mess and quarrel with another.

If the only thing to be done is to give over to every existing tenant his holding subject to a rent to be raised periodically by valuation, and if this is to be done because the Irish tenants will take nothing else, and if the Irish tenants are to have whatever they like to ask, undoubtedly the Government Bill is wrongly conceived. We shall always come back to the pregnant dictum of Captain WHITE, that this may be spoliation, but that spoliation is the proper basis of all land tenure, and is particularly suited to Ireland. But the bulk of the Irish members had not got to this stage of philosophy. They were satisfied with the proposal to make eviction pecuniarily unprofitable. They set out on the same platform with the Government, and only differed as to details. It is true that details are generally the subject-matter of discussion in Committee, and do not suggest arguments that are material to the question whether a Bill shall or shall not be read a second time. But on this occasion it has been most useful that in this indirect manner, at great length, in a dreary prolix way, the Irish members have by an overwhelming majority made it clear at this early stage that they accept the main principles of the Bill which is to render evictions not illegal, but unprofitable. The particular objections they urged against this and that provision of the Bill are of very secondary interest. The one important thing is that the Irish members, with a totally insignificant exception, have pronounced that this is what ought to satisfy the Irish tenants. Whether it will satisfy them is a minor matter. There are Irishmen who, if England gave them the whole terrestrial globe, would swear by the harp of Erin that they would go off into space unless they got the moon too. It is of no use trying to please such people. But it is a great comfort to find that what the Imperial Parliament can give fairly and effectually is what the tenants can properly expect. Conservative Irishmen, moderate Irish-

men, wild Irishmen, very wild Irishmen, all concurred in acceding to the main principle of the Bill. Mr. O'REILLY DEASE, who thought the measure wise and statesmanlike, was followed by Sir H. BRUCE, who thought that it was no worse than Lord MAYO'S Bill. Mr. BAGWELL considered that the Bill was so complicated as at present drawn that the best thing a landlord could do, if it passed, was to keep an attorney expressly to litigate for him, though the Bill might be made a good Bill in Committee. Sir F. HEYGATE, after showing that the Bill was opposed to the principles of free-trade, founded on injustice, and conceived in ignorance, concluded with an opinion that he would be a very bold man who said No to the Second Reading. Mr. KAVANAGH, whose speech was on a higher level, expressly said that he approved the Bill because it placed pecuniary penalties on eviction. Mr. PIM applauded the Bill because it was so devised as to lead the people to a system of fair and even contract. The lion and the lamb, Mr. G. H. MOORE and The O'DONOGHUE, lay down sweetly together, and babbled praises of the Bill. Mr. MOORE openly proclaimed that the Bill was founded on just principles. The O'DONOGHUE, after pronouncing himself a member of the extreme Tenant-Right party, declared his conviction that the Bill was an honest one, and calculated to do great good. These sayings deserve to be recorded. The Imperial Parliament has now virtually sanctioned a measure which is not only, according to its views and in its honest intention, a measure that ought to be acceptable to Ireland, but which the large majority of those specially commissioned to represent Ireland have welcomed as well calculated to be acceptable to Ireland. The Irish members have given their certificate that justice is being done to Ireland; and we may reasonably hope that this certificate will be all the Government will think necessary to have for their justification, and that now something like an attempt to restore law and order may be begun.

It is not the time now to follow the Irish members into their criticisms on the details of the measure. Sometimes these criticisms seem, so far as we can understand them, to have arisen from an insufficient study of the Bill; sometimes, like that of Mr. KAVANAGH, as to the necessity of imposing some limit on retrospective claims for compensation, they appear to suggest real improvements. But matters of this sort can be discussed when the Bill gets into Committee. For the moment it is more important to notice the more general current of their remarks. In the first place, many of them were angry at the sharp line drawn between Ulster and the other provinces; and Captain WHITE boldly stated that the preference given to Ulster was a branch of the old noxious tree of Protestant ascendancy which it was hoped Mr. GLADSTONE grubbed up last year. That Ulster got an unfair advantage, and was promoted into a sort of intolerable pre-eminence, seemed to rankle in minds like that of Mr. PIM, which we might have expected to have been free from such a feeling. In the region of common sense it might be stated in reply, that Tenant-Right is treated of as peculiar to Ulster in the Bill, because it is scarcely known anywhere else. But in the region of Irish sentiment this is no answer, and it might be wise to remove this pebble of offence. It is a mere matter of wording. A clause could easily be drawn which would do all that the framers of the Bill wished to do, and omit the name of Ulster altogether. It might simply enact that wherever the Court could find that, as a matter of fact, a custom existed permitting the tenant to sell the goodwill, and that the custom had been acted on for a length of time and was known to all parties concerned, it should be legally recognised. If, as Mr. PIM says, such a custom is to be found in some parts of Wexford, then the tenantry in those parts of Wexford would benefit by it just as much as if they lived in Ulster. To shape the Bill in this way would be nothing more than an amiable concession to Irish prejudice, or perhaps to the superior information of persons bringing new facts to the knowledge of the Government. On some points the views of the Irish members certainly contributed new light to the general discussion. The unanimity with which men of both parties deprecated any scheme that would place the labourers at the mercy of the tenants, and the conviction they expressed that pauper tenants would have recourse to any shift that would enable them to squat their pauper relatives on the land, showed that the darker pictures of Irish tenant life are not without truth. To job for their families, and to tyrannize over their dependents, are the inveterate habits which the patrons of Irish tenants attribute to their clients. Still more remarkable was the general assent given to the scheme for creating small proprietors. That Mr. BRIGHT'S plan would

fail was frequently asserted by Irish members, but it was almost universally admitted that it was desirable it should succeed. It seems to be felt even by great Conservative proprietors that the creation of small proprietorships would contribute a Conservative and salutary element to Irish society. This does not show that small proprietorships can be created, or that, if created, they could endure, but it shows that in Mr. BRIGHT'S scheme, which was once thought must be the most dangerous part of a Bill proposed by the present Ministry, the Irish landlords see something which, if it works at all, will work rather for than against them.

THE COUNCIL AND THE CATHOLIC POWERS.

IT seems probable that the Catholic Powers are about to claim, though somewhat late in the day, to be represented at the Vatican Council. It is only with regard to France that the statement has been made with any approach to definiteness; but if France has really determined to take this step, Austria, and possibly Spain, are sure to follow her lead. Whether the POPE will recognise the claim as a matter of right, or grant it as a matter of favour, or reject it altogether, are points upon which it would be extremely rash to indulge in confident predictions. There is something to be said on behalf of each course, and the opinions of his advisers—perhaps even the sentiments of the Sovereign Pontiff himself—are not likely to be absolutely in harmony with one another. On the side of recognising the claim it may be urged that the very fact of its being proffered, however impious may have been the desire which prompted it, is in itself a retreat from that attitude of polite indifference to the proceedings of the Council which was originally assumed by Catholic Governments, and especially by that of France. The mutual independence of Church and State is not a doctrine to which the POPE bears any love, though he may have found out by this time that it has its good as well as its bad side; and the formal representation of lay Governments at a purely spiritual assembly would show that the State still admits that it has special duties towards the Church, however mistaken may be its conception of what those duties are. Even if the POPE thinks fit to assert his independence of all temporal authorities by refusing to admit the claim, he may still think it expedient to allow the envoys to take their seats in the Council, in the belief that the course of events will be in no way affected thereby. The triumph over a minority consisting not merely of a hundred or so refractory bishops, but of the accredited envoys of two out of the five Great Powers, would be dangerously attractive to a POPE who is profoundly convinced that no weapon formed against him will be allowed to prosper, and who may therefore regard the multiplication of his adversaries as only the prelude to their more conspicuous overthrow. Or, again, the POPE may prefer to manifest his disregard of lay criticism by the total exclusion of lay representatives. His cause can gain so little from any lay quarter that he may fairly think it more prudent to push to its utmost limits that theory of ecclesiastical freedom which, though it may be somewhat inconvenient in Italy, admits of being turned to considerable account in some other parts of the world. No former Council has been so entirely emancipated from lay control or influence, and the exclusion of the political element from even a suspensive voice in the proceedings has no doubt greatly contributed to this result. The Ambassadors of France and Austria would necessarily have been in communication with the Opposition bishops, and the persistence of the latter would certainly have been strengthened by the additional certainty thus obtained of the support of the Catholic Powers.

It is a further question, and one that is not much affected by the answer given to the former one, whether the growing jealousy of the action of the Council which has of late been manifested by the French and Austrian Cabinets will operate as a check or an incentive to the execution of the Papal designs. The prospect of an open breach with France, followed by a withdrawal of the French troops and the waiver of the veto hitherto interposed against the possession of Rome by Italy, may seem sufficiently serious to make the politicians of the Roman Court think twice before surrendering themselves to the enthusiastic impulses of PIUS IX. When it is borne in mind that of late years the preservation of the POPE'S temporal sovereignty has divided the affections of the Ultramontane party with the dogma of infallibility itself, it seems strange that they can look with indifference upon the imminent withdrawal of its last earthly support. We do not wish to decry the faith of the Ultramontanes in the Divine guardianship of

this cherished anachronism, but it is not too much to say that up to this time it has been a faith that worketh by bayonets. They have seen so direct an exhibition of supernatural care in the convenient intervention of the arm of flesh that it may seem like tempting Providence to reject the means which have hitherto been effectual for the accomplishment of the blessed result. Still there is another side to the question, and one which is perhaps more likely to approve itself to the POPE and his advisers. The intended promulgation of the dogma of infallibility has for its main object the subjection of the Catholic Opposition throughout Europe. Even in the plenitude of the Papal despotism, inconveniences have arisen from the presence of a Liberal and independent section within the Church itself, and to silence it for the future may appear a victory worth gaining even at the cost of an open quarrel with the powers of the world. The POPE has probably a higher opinion of the catholicity of the Opposition than it may suit his purpose or his temper to confess to. He may talk from time to time as though he were prepared to provoke an actual schism rather than shrink from defining his own infallibility, but it is far more likely that he has no real fear of his resolution being thus tried. His calculation rather is, that it is only necessary for him to speak as the declared oracle of God to ensure the submission of men who, however much they may have played with the unclean thing, will still, when the alternative is put nakedly before them, prefer obedience to excommunication. Count DARU's remonstrances, therefore, may seem to him mere frightened entreaties prompted by the consciousness that, if once the Council declares the POPE infallible, there will be no place left for Catholic politicians. In that case more motives than one might lead the POPE to receive them with contemptuous silence.

Perhaps this careless attitude is all the easier to maintain because it has yet to be seen whether in writing the letters from which extracts, to all appearance accurate, were printed in the *Times* the other day, Count DARU has not been threatening worse consequences than are at all certain to follow. Count DARU expresses himself with entire confidence as to the effect of the promulgation of infallibility upon public opinion in France. It would be impossible, he says, to keep the French troops in the Roman States a day after the adoption of the dogma. The Council is itself putting arms into the hands of the revolutionary party, and turning the Conservative position at the precise moment when it is most important that it should be maintained and strengthened. We confess that we are by no means sure that the French nation will be as much troubled at a decision in favour of infallibility as Count DARU supposes. The party which demands the recall of the French troops from Rome is but too little open to religious influences of any sort to find material reinforcement in the indiscretions of the Papal Government. As a rule, the French democrats hate Liberal Catholicism quite as cordially as Ultramontaniam, while those of them whose anti-religious enthusiasm is less pronounced will probably say with Count BEUSI that the State has no right to object to the proclamation of purely religious dogmas, and that the question of the occupation of Rome is not affected by any step of this kind which the Council may see fit to take. On the other hand, the party which has hitherto defended the Imperial policy with regard to Rome has done so either from religious or from political motives. With the exception of a few Liberal Catholics, the former class are probably infallibilists already, while the latter are chiefly concerned about keeping the Italians out of Rome. Politicians may be irritated by what they will consider an additional exhibition of Papal folly, but they are no more likely to withdraw their opposition to the further aggrandizement of Italy because the POPE makes a bad use of the protection accorded him, than England would be to allow Russia to seize Constantinople because the SULTAN had arrogated to himself some new title to the devotion of pious Mahometans. The points said to be raised in Count BEUSI's recent despatch have more capabilities of being made the occasion of a serious conflict between the Church and the civil power. It is clear that a Church which asserts its right to declare this or that secular law to be not binding on Catholics may be a source of the gravest inconvenience to the authority by which these laws are imposed. But this inconvenience does not originate in the Council; it is inseparable from the existence of a religious society claiming supreme jurisdiction in matters of conscience. It was an inconvenience felt by the Roman Empire in the second century as well as by the Austro-Hungarian monarchy in the nineteenth. The growing severance between religious and

secular thought tends no doubt to bring it into increased prominence, but even if the Council had not met, it would still have been conspicuous among the political problems which now press for solution.

THE NATURALIZATION BILL.

THE difficulties of framing a new law of naturalization concerned the draftsman rather than the Government; and the Bill now before Parliament, though it is confused and awkward in language, is not much more unintelligible than ordinary projects of law. Although legislation has become necessary for political reasons, the principles which will henceforth regulate the retention or transfer of allegiance were inevitably destined to prevail either by direct enactment or by tacit understanding. The reasons which had caused the adoption of the old rule of inalienable nationality had long ceased to be operative; and the constant flow of emigration to the territory of an independent and powerful State involved a practical contradiction of the legal doctrine. Perhaps a tenth part of the inhabitants of the United States may have been born in the United Kingdom, and another fifth part may, as children or grandchildren of English, Scotch, and Irish parents, come within the comprehensive definition of subjects of the English Crown. As all but the most recent settlers are also citizens of the United States, while few even of last year's emigrants have any intention of retracing their steps, it was obviously impossible to reclaim the services of millions of supposed subjects, and it was highly undesirable to undertake any responsibility on their behalf. The anomalous conflict of allegiance was a principal cause of the inglorious war of 1812. The English Government, in assertion of a claim which was fully recognised by American law, imprudently insisted on pressing English sailors on board American ships. In the crisis of the conflict with NAPOLEON there was a strong temptation to disregard all impediments which obstructed the manning of the navy; but a prudent Government would have anticipated the willingness of the Americans to take advantage of the difficulties of England. The war which was commenced by the Government of the United States for the abolition of the right of search for seamen ended without even a nominal settlement of the disputed question; nor could it be expected that in that generation the concession which had been refused when it would have averted an embarrassing attack would be voluntarily tendered by a Government no longer engaged in the desperate European struggle which had encouraged American hostility. In modern times it is certain that the pretension would not be enforced, although it has never been formally abandoned. Indeed the new Act will scarcely affect the condition of English sailors on board American ships, as they will seldom have taken the trouble to obtain certificates of naturalization. No further question arose between the Peace of 1815 and the commencement of the Civil War in 1861. When it became probable that the Northern Government would resort to conscription, many settlers who had never previously thought of their duty to their native country applied to the English Minister and Consuls for protection against compulsory service. According to the letter of the law their applications were well founded; but the Crown, in the exercise of its discretion, declined to interfere in cases where the settler had applied for American naturalization. On the other side, the Federal Government readily allowed that English residents who retained their original domicile were exempt from liability to conscription.

The appointment of a Commission to inquire into the laws of naturalization and allegiance, and the Bill which was recently introduced by the LORD CHANCELLOR, originated in the Fenian conspiracy and in the jealous and irritable patriotism which is habitually excited in the United States by any occasion of a controversy with England. Many Irish-Americans who were thrown out of military employment by the close of the war heard, like DUGALD DALGETTY in similar circumstances, with inexpressible delight, that there was a hope of bloodshed in their own dear country. As long as Ireland was prosperous and peaceful they would never have troubled their native shores with their presence; but in becoming naturalized citizens of the United States they had mentally reserved a contingent right of rebellion against the English Government. In principle they unconsciously adopted the technical rule of *nemo potest exuere patriam*; but at the same time they regarded themselves as fully entitled to all the immunities of foreigners. An Irish rebel is in the nature of things an English subject, and it might have been supposed that resistance to Imperial oppression could only be offered by its

victims; but the disbanded Fenians of the Federal army insisted on combining the characters of Irish patriots and of American citizens; and Congress, the press, and the politicians of the United States unanimously supported their claim. Within a few weeks speeches have been made in the House of Representatives on the sufferings of imaginary American citizens who are supposed to be groaning in British dungeons; and, in opposition to the uniform decisions of American Courts and to the opinions of American text writers, it has become an article of the popular creed that a naturalized American has in all respects the rights of a native citizen. Indignant orators and journalists seldom trouble themselves to remember that in all civilized States aliens, in common with citizens or subjects, are civilly and criminally liable to the consequences of their acts according to the law of the land. If a man conspires against the English Government within its dominions it matters nothing to the Court which tries and sentences him whether he is Irish or American or French; but in two or three cases a conflict arose between the established rule of English and American law and the popular American doctrine, which, although it rested on no legal authority, was in itself neither unreasonable nor unjust. A few naturalized American citizens born in the United Kingdom claimed to be tried as aliens by a jury chosen *de medietate linguae*. The demand was necessarily rejected by the Courts; but the refusal was represented as a grievance, although it is doubtful whether a safeguard to foreigners provided by municipal law can become the subject of international reclamation. It might indeed be plausibly contended that the English Government was bound to concede to American citizens all the legal privileges which were at the time secured to foreigners; but the substantial answer to all remonstrances was that the law administered by the Irish Judges was the same with that of the United States. The prisoners were not entitled to a mixed jury, because in contemplation of law they were English subjects. The same answer applied to the objection that in some of the trials evidence had been received of overt acts performed in the United States; and it was also urged that the character of a transaction completed in Ireland might be explained, even on the prosecution of an alien, by previous words or acts which would not of themselves have been cognisable by Irish tribunals. As might have been expected, legal arguments produced as little impression on indignant Americans as the substantial justice of the case. All parties clamorously demanded the protection of naturalized American citizens; and when the English Government expressed its willingness to alter the law, the same disappointment was perhaps felt which sometimes follows a vehement push against an open door. When the LORD CHANCELLOR'S Bill becomes law, naturalized Americans will cease to be English subjects; and if they nevertheless think fit to organize Fenian conspiracies, as long as they confine their operations to the soil of their adopted country they may pursue their occupation with impunity. If they tamper with rebellion when they are within English or Irish jurisdiction, they must take the consequences of their acts; and the Bill properly provides against their escape through the obsolete machinery of a mixed jury. There is not a little absurdity in the claim to be tried by a jury, half of a different tongue, when it is preferred by an accused person who knows no language but English. The alien moiety of the jury might be French or German, for it was never provided that a foreign prisoner should be tried by countrymen of his own. There may be some doubt whether foreign Governments have a right to claim the benefit of the existing law for their subjects; but they can assuredly not object to the abolition of the privilege by the English Legislature. The trifling change in the constitution of juries will perhaps be the most useful part of the Bill. The rest, although it is both practically expedient and essentially sound in principle, will have served its chief purpose in removing the pretext for a factitious clamour. There is not one case in a hundred thousand in which it matters whether a naturalized American retains or abandons his English allegiance. The questions between the United States and Prussia were much more serious, although they were not complicated by passionate declamation. It was of some importance to German emigrants that they should, if they temporarily returned to their native country, not be subjected to the obligation of military service. An Englishman naturalized in the United States may come and go at his pleasure without the smallest risk of inquiry into any conflicting claims of nationality.

The Naturalization Treaty will probably be ratified by the Senate, as it is exclusively designed to remove an American grievance. In more important matters there is at present no

apparent tendency to a settlement of disputes. General BADEAU, an able and eminent officer who is believed to possess the confidence of the PRESIDENT, has lately published in *Macmillan's Magazine* an address to his own countrymen, with the laudable object of diminishing their hostility to England, but unfortunately his appeal is founded on a misunderstanding of the English side of the controversy. He states with perfect truth that many Englishmen of all classes supported the Northern cause during the civil war; but the insuperable objection to Mr. SUMNER's arguments and pretensions has nothing whatever to do with the feelings or wishes for which the people of an independent country owe no account to foreigners. General BADEAU is also mistaken in his belief that the indignation caused by Mr. SUMNER's speech was caused by the study of garbled extracts. The whole speech has been published in full in several forms, and General BADEAU may be well assured that all serious critics of that document were fully acquainted with every word which it contained. Mr. Fish's despatch, which was still more unreasonable and offensive, is the latest official statement of the American claim, and it furnishes an authoritative comment on those passages in the PRESIDENT's Message which the majority of English journalists amicably and weakly attempted to explain away. When an American of the highest intelligence, sincerely desirous of friendly relations with England, adopts all the statements and arguments of Mr. SUMNER and Mr. Fish, and passes over without notice Lord CLARENDON's conclusive reply, which he has probably seen, although it was not communicated to the Senate, he only proves that the chasm which he desires to bridge over is as wide as ever.

CONSERVATIVES IN THE CITY.

THERE is a good deal in the City Banquet which came off on Wednesday with which we can sympathize. In the first place, that the Conservatives have good appetites, or at any rate have the stomach to sit down to a good dinner, is a matter of national and general interest. Their present position in politics, of having to watch and wait and stand out in the cold, requires a certain fortifying of the inner man. Vigilance and an empty stomach are incompatible. But when we have said this we have said everything which can, at least to bystanders, recommend the propriety of the dinner at the Cannon Street Hotel. Strictly speaking, it was not a celebration of any great triumph of civic Conservatism. The Conservatives can scarcely look at the City representation and be very thankful. The City is represented by four Liberal members, and though at the last General Election a Tory was returned, yet on his death and in a single-handed election the Conservatives did not venture on a contest. Lambeth, Hackney, the Tower Hamlets, Finsbury, Chelsea, Marylebone, Greenwich, all of which constituencies are only fringes of the City, have returned Liberals; and when such distinguished statesmen as Baron ROTHSCHILD and the brothers LAWRENCE, Messrs. M'ARTHUR and HOLMES and Alderman LUSK, are, *faut de mieux*, metropolitan members, the Conservatives have little cause to be very sanguine of their prospects in London. Mr. SMITH, it is true, sits in the seat of OLD GLORY, and the fiery Lord GEORGE HAMILTON and the chivalrous Mr. BERESFORD at any rate make up to the party in zeal what it wants in numbers; and as Mr. MORGAN HOWARD is, according to his friends, sure to be returned some day or other, it is not for us to say that the banqueters had not good reason for the sanguine attitude which they took up on Wednesday. The Conservative reaction, we are assured not for the first time, has set in, and that it has set in is proved by the flourishing results of the Registration in the City. Mr. GATHORNE HARDY, who to do him justice is always ready to look facts in the face, put the simple question why this dinner took place. "He presumed that they were here for some object and purpose." And he answered his own question. "As he understood it, they were there to congratulate the City Conservative Association on the success which they achieved at the General Election, and upon the more important success which they have achieved at the late registration." As to the former success Mr. HARDY plainly and honestly, if not judiciously, reminded the revellers that a triumph won by the minority clause was not much to boast of—and, he might have added, had proved in this case evanescent; but he seems to have accepted the victory in the Registration Courts because he was told that it was so. Mr. DISRAELI—who, unfortunately, was not present—speaks of this event as a great constitutional triumph, and in a fine didactic spirit announces the great political truth that an

elector who is not registered cannot vote. Mr. DISRAELI did not say that, after all, he was but cribbing Sir ROBERT PEEL's famous platitude about the battle of the Constitution being fought in the Registration Courts. It is something, however, to get some sound, large, intelligible policy from either of the great political parties. The Conservatives have agreed upon a policy, and that policy is based upon a political axiom. Summarily enunciated, it is—and so Messrs. HARDY and DISRAELI put it—that to get Conservative representatives you must have a majority of the electors, and the only way to secure the votes of the electors is to take care that the electors are registered. To discover this truth and to enlarge on the discovery is quite a sufficient justification for three hundred and fifty gentlemen to dine together. We may observe that not a single speaker produced a scrap of figures or returns to prove this triumph in the City Registration Courts. But as we are not in a better position to deny it than the Conservatives are to assert it, we hope that it may turn out to be the case, for the extant condition of the representation of London is not a matter of congratulation to any party.

We do not intend to find fault with the speakers at Cannon Street that they spoke with somewhat bated breath. As the Opposition is not going seriously to oppose the Irish Land Bill, or the Education Bill, the orators may well be pardoned for the discretion which they exercised when, having little to say, they said that little inoffensively. A veteran Arctic navigator may be pardoned for indulging, or at least expressing, a belief that the Conservative reaction will some day or other be so complete that our ironclads will be superseded by the good old-fashioned wooden walls of NELSON and COLLINGWOOD. Nor are we disposed to be very severe on the breezy young nobleman who congratulated the army and Volunteers on being very discontented; but Sir JOHN PAKINGTON, who has been and may again be a Cabinet Minister, ought to have remembered that even indirectly to approve of a spirit which might tend to mutiny is hardly compatible with official responsibilities. In short, the more prudent of the Conservative leaders are quite aware that the less of direct criticism they venture upon the better for themselves. The authors of Household Suffrage are estopped from a serious complaint of the results of their own measure; and as, when in office, they took credit for economical estimates, they must in their hearts be thankful that it was not left to them to reduce the effective force of the army and navy. It is a happier fate for the Tories to assure themselves after dinner that, as Sir EDWARD BELCHER idiomatically says, the service is going to the bad, than to have had the hard lot, which if they had retained office they could not have escaped, of falling foul of the dearest traditions and prejudices of the United Service Clubs. And if we were disposed to draw any general conclusion from the speeches of Wednesday night as indicating anything like a distinct understanding among each other on the part of the Conservatives, it would be that they are learning to acquiesce in the policy which was recommended to them in a well-known article in the *Quarterly Review*. Mr. DISRAELI, who affects to believe in the existence or the possibility of a Tory democracy, was fortunately absent; his henchman, Lord JOHN MANNERS, to whom we are assured we owe all those wonderful effects of Tory liberalism which were to discount Radicalism itself, was significantly silent. The great lords, like FAIRFAX, were significantly absent, and were cautious enough to express their sympathy with Mr. FOWLER by letters which were not read. Mr. GATHORNE HARDY superseded the Duke of MARLBOROUGH in announcing the Conservative programme, and, as we have said, it is modest and, we are bound to add, simple enough. We should have thought perhaps that it is a trifle too "umble." The Tory organ complains of its vagueness as well as modesty. Mr. HARDY just glanced at what he considered the immediate duty of Conservatives in defending the Government against their allies; but whether he felt convinced that Mr. GLADSTONE's Cabinet was sufficiently divided in opinion, or whether he thought that a bold assertion of patriotic duties in maintaining order would revive inconvenient recollections, certain it is that he just approached, only to show that he was afraid of pursuing, a subject which might even yet perhaps warm the sympathies of the country. It is not for us to suggest popular topics to the Conservative party, but we can quite understand that there is a weakness in the present Government which the Opposition might make more of than they seem capable of doing. Very apt in legislation, with unexampled powers of originating and devising measures, the present Ministers are exceptionally weak in administration. The English people are a law-loving and orderly folk; and the state of Ireland really does fill them with alarm and solicitude, not so much

for the mere amount of crime committed as because the Government seems incapable of dealing with it. Here, again, Mr. WALPOLE's colleagues can hardly venture upon denouncing the imbecility or incapacity of any Executive; and it amounts to very little to say that the Duke of ABERCORN left Ireland with less crime than Lord SPENCER finds there, when everybody remembers that Fenianism grew more and more insolent just as BEALES and BRADLAUGH and the London mobs received more immunity from a Tory Ministry. There is a danger to the present Government. Everybody respects, and most people admire, Mr. GLADSTONE, but they suspect that he has practical deficiencies. He has plenty of conscientious scruples, but there are emergencies in which physical fibre is wanted. A sensitive nature is very attractive; but a certain callousness has its occasional value. What we are yearning for is law and order and security. It is not in Ireland alone, but in lesser things and in administration generally, that we want it. We want security in person, and in public. We want the poverty question dealt with, not talked about. We want to know whether we are drifting on to Communism or not, or, if not, whether we ought to be. We are alarmed—a good many at least of us are—by the constantly recurring imbecility of the Home Office, no matter who presides over it, in the presence of crime and insolence. A Minister who is successfully defied by the cabmen is contemptible; and we are not yet prepared to acquiesce in the unavoidable necessity of contemptible departments of State. We do not like to be assured by a Cabinet Minister that it is not the duty of any department of State to compel tradesmen to be honest, and that the lives of the subjects, just weights and measures, and the fundamental laws of society are not the first, or indeed any, concern of Government. Here is the weakness of Mr. GLADSTONE's Ministry. It is to be sought in Ireland—at the Home Office—at the Board of Trade. The Conservative party might appeal to British instincts; but, as far as can be judged by their last public meeting, they are as little capable of using their opportunities as the Government in too many branches of administration seem resolved to throw their advantages away.

MATHEMATICIANS UNDER A CLOUD.

MATHEMATICIANS, living and dead, have of late had rather a bad time of it in France. M. Leverrier has been dismissed from the directorship of the Observatory in Paris. The sanity of the late Auguste Comte has been in question before a French tribunal. M. Michel Chasles has appeared again, and for the last time it may be hoped, in the character of the most egregious dupe in contemporary history. Against M. Leverrier no more serious charge seems to have been made than that he was of an incurably quarrelsome temper. His colleagues and assistants could not get on with him. Kant, in a celebrated passage, compares the spectacle of the starry heavens at midnight, as a source of reverence and awe, with the deep inner consciousness of the moral law. Pascal, in a sentence equally well-known, expresses the terror with which the thought and the sight of the infinite spaces oppressed him. M. Leverrier, officially surveying the skies as a sort of celestial inspector-general, appears to have kept his mind free from these elevating and subduing influences. He had to report upon the movements and perturbations of the stellar bodies, and seemed to regard himself only as a kind of astronomical French detective. The influences which penetrated Kant and Pascal left him unaffected. A poet more frequently quoted than read has remarked that an undevout astronomer is mad. There is no reason to suppose that M. Leverrier is an undevout astronomer. On the contrary, the second and third of the three adjectives in the celebrated epitaph which described its subject as bland, passionate, and deeply religious may, for aught we know, strictly apply to him. The capacity of turning from celestial contemplations to human wranglings and strife is, however, remarkable. The calm order and the regular movement of the heavenly bodies might be expected to shed something of their own repose into the minds of those who habitually survey them. The music of the spheres does not appear, like the harp of David or the lyre of Timotheus, to cast the evil spirit out of those who listen to it. One would have thought that a certain stillness of temper and largeness of intelligence would have been derived from intercourse with the stars. It seems that a man may dwell all his life amid the sublimest stellar scenery and be as little impressed by it as the Alpine peasant by the grandeur of his mountains, or the American backwoodsman by the religion of the groves. M. Leverrier returned from knocking his sublime head against the stars, to knock it with violence against the heads of his colleagues. The quarrels of the Observatory are perplexing. *Tantane animis celestibus ire?*

The case of Auguste Comte is somewhat harder. Like the kings of ancient Egypt he has been subjected to posthumous judgment. A French Court has been called on to determine whether the High Priest of Humanity was in the days of his religious exaltation and official pontificate neither more nor

less than a lunatic. The wounded feelings of Mr. Richard Congreve, Professor Beesly, and Mr. Frederic Harrison, at this suggestion and inquiry, form a subject too painful for contemplation. We hasten to drop a veil over the agonizing picture. Archbishop Manning reading Father Gratry's proof that Pope Honorius was a heretic, or a faithful Mormon emigrant newly come from Wales listening to the demonstration of the Messrs. Smith junior, sons of Joe the prophet, that Brigham Young is a deceiver, may faintly image the grief and desolation of the Comtist Church. One of the most afflicting circumstances in the whole business is the fact that a woman should have so far forgotten her function in the Religion of Humanity as to ask for a judgment of insanity against its founder. Madame Comte was her illustrious husband's accuser. It is true that she had no very distinct place, and indeed no place at all, in his system. He never showed any disposition to worship her. The private religious observances which he practised were in honour of the departed spirit of Madame Clotilde de Vaux. That lady was elevated to the rank, during her life and after her death, of Comte's guardian angel; and Madame Comte had no title or obligation to assume the office. Whether, like Donna Inez in *Don Juan*, she "called some druggists and physicians," we do not know, but she certainly "tried to prove her loving lord was mad." It was the judgment of the Court rather than hers, which, "as he had some lucid intermissions, next decided he was only bad." In other respects, however, M. Comte, rather than his wife, seems to have acted the part of Inez. It was he "who kept a journal where her faults were noted," and confided secrets to "certain trunks of books and letters." M. Comte appears also to have vilified his wife in his will—a course of conduct to which, if she had been not his wife but his daughter, an episcopal parallel might be cited. Against Madame Comte's character there is by universal confession no well-grounded imputation whatsoever. Comte himself in his better days admitted as much. The Court granted her such redress as was in its power, and confided to her keeping the papers in which she was interested; but it properly declined to brand Comte himself as insane. It is curious that this trial should have taken place some years, we believe, after the date which Comte had fixed for the commission to his hands of the Directorate of Public Education in France. It occurred about the time when the Emperor Napoleon, having fulfilled his mission of resisting the representative system, ought to have resigned the French Government to a proletarian triumvirate, whose mission it would be to prepare the way for the definite establishment of the Positivist system in Church and State. Messieurs Emile Ollivier, Daru, and Buffet do not bear much resemblance to a proletarian triumvirate; and alas! for the uprooting of Parliamentary institutions and the voluntary resignation of the Emperor. But if mistaken prophecy is the mark of a madman, Dr. Cumming, living, is not safer from the charge and its consequences than Comte, dead. It is open, moreover, to Mr. Richard Congreve, or any priest of humanity who feels so minded, to contend that, if Comte had survived to become Director of Public Instruction in France, all the rest would have followed. Dr. Cumming has not left himself any similar loophole. If any one likes to pronounce that many of Comte's opinions and practical aims were extravagant, absurd, or, with more rhetorical emphasis, insane, we shall by no means contradict him. There are people who would possibly say as much of Mr. Carlyle's ideal of society and of government, and of M. Louis Blanc's, of Plato's imaginary republic, and of Calvin's actual theocracy, or the theological opinions of the late Mr. Henry Drummond. The overweening egotism of Comte often seemed to show mental derangement, but it did not exceed that of Rousseau. The demon of Socrates and the amulet of Pascal would afford ground as good for an historic commission *de lunatico inquirendo* as any of M. Comte's eccentricities. The theological bigotry and cowardice which deplore that a French Court of Law declined to pronounce a judgment of insanity on a system of philosophy and polity, sound or unsound, wise or foolish, have in England illustrated nothing more than the alarming intolerance of an aggressive and half-educated Dissent. Biography and criticism may take account of the fact that M. Comte's early St. Simonianism and his late assumption of the Supreme Pontificate of Humanity were separated from each other by what he used to call a severe cerebral crisis spent within a *maison de santé*. But Courts have no jurisdiction to try the sanity of a system of philosophy.

More unfortunate than Leverrier or Comte is a mathematician yet more illustrious than either. Vrain Lucas, the forger, has taken his place in prison and in history; and he will go down to posterity attended by M. Michel Chasles as his dupe. Mathematical opinion places M. Chasles, we believe, not only in the first rank among the cultivators of his science, but first among the first. Yet he will presently be forgotten by all but a few *savans*, for science leaves its most successful cultivators little more than the shadow of a name, passing them by as it speeds on to its goal. He will be remembered, however, in the history of folly, which is fresh in every age. There is something of tragedy in the story of M. Chasles, and tragedy is not the less painful for the commingling of the ludicrous. No greater calamity can happen to a man of brains than to be made a fool of. His intellect is his point of honour, as courage is a soldier's, and chastity a woman's. M. Chasles is the hero of a fool's tragedy. Perhaps every tragedy deserves this title, calamity entering through some crevice in the armour of wisdom. Be this as it may, there is no doubt of the special appropriateness the name of in this case. But for Vrain

Lucas, the weakness of M. Chasles might have been unknown to himself and to the world. In that forger he met his destiny, as Napoleon used to say that in Sir Sidney Smith he encountered the man who marred his fate. It is a pity that some mystic foreboding did not warn him of the approach of his evil genius. The advocate of Vrain Lucas apologized for him, we believe, on the ground that M. Chasles's simplicity and credulity were really too tempting to be resisted. The man who could believe in the authenticity of letters from Mary Magdalen, Lazarus, and Pontius Pilate, and from Julius Græcinus to Jesus Christ, was a seductive victim. The forgery by which Pascal was made to rob Newton of his great discovery, and the letter which Louis XIV., being then an infant of three years, spoke, "in a voice so often all-powerful, of the illustrious, persecuted Galileo, the friend of his grandmother, Marie de Medicis," would probably have failed to deceive M. Chasles, if the national vanity of a Frenchman had not blunted the acuteness in his own special department of a man of science. A feeling like that which has kept the *Vengeur* floating in French history, long after it had been sunk by Mr. Carlyle's great guns, has led M. Thiers, it is said, to justify the maintenance as true of these now admitted forgeries.

The manner in which M. Leverrier, the late Auguste Comte, and M. Michel Chasles have lately come before the public, has some bearing on a controversy which was waged rather fiercely nearly five-and-thirty years ago between Sir William Hamilton and Dr. Whewell, and which has lately been renewed by Mr. Mill in his examination of the Scotch philosopher's writings. The proposition which, if we recollect aright, is found in Dean Aldrich, that some good logicians are bad mathematicians, was practically converted by Sir William Hamilton into the assertion that no mathematician was good for anything else. He brought all his learning to the proof of this strange opinion as a matter of fact, and all his logic and philosophy to establish it on grounds of reasoning. Sir William Hamilton of Edinburgh, as Professor de Morgan used to call him, unconsciously anticipating the Papal definition of Dr. Cumming of Scotland, hated mathematicians with a thoroughgoing hatred, and could not bear their intrusion into his own department of thought. He cursed Mr. De Morgan as heartily for his doctrine of numerically definite syllogisms as the ancient grammarian prayed heaven to confound his rival for his theory of irregular verbs. It is still safe on this side of the Tweed to express dissent from some of the opinions of Sir William Hamilton. North of it, he has been erected into a kind of metaphysical Pope, and divides intellectual empire with John Knox. If Scotland still possessed an independent Parliament, one of its first acts would probably be to make the questioning of any doctrine of Hamilton's philosophy a penal offence, as the contradiction of Aristotle was in France during a part of the middle ages. We sometimes feel very anxious for Professor Bain at Aberdeen. The boldness which urged Servetus to Geneva was scarcely greater than that which led Mr. Mill to St. Andrew's to deliver his Inaugural Address. The metaphysical reign of terror has not, however, penetrated into England. We venture, therefore, to question the dictum that mathematician and blockhead are practically convertible terms. Sir William Hamilton assumed that everything foolish which has ever been said and done by a mathematician is due to his mathematics; and that everything wise which may be attributed to him springs from some other source. Mathematicians who are only mathematicians prove that special ability in their science not only may consist, but is naturally associated, with general dulness. Mathematicians who are eminent in other things prove that a man may be secondarily a mathematician who is primarily something better, the higher order of ability including the lower. Putting every mathematician arbitrarily into one or other of these two classes, Sir William Hamilton proves his case by begging the question. It is amusing to note the collision between Sir William Hamilton's mathematical and his philosophical antipathies. He cannot resist quoting from Condillac the statement that of four celebrated metaphysicians—Descartes, Malebranche, Leibnitz, and Locke—Locke, who was not a mathematician, was greatly superior to the other three. Sir William, who hated Locke almost as much as he did Dr. Thomas Brown or Mr. De Morgan, is constrained to dispute Condillac's judgment in the act of quoting it for the purpose of his argument. It is curious that Sir William Hamilton's immediate predecessors in the Scotch school of philosophy—Reid and Dugald Stewart—whose works are to his as the text is to the comment, were both professors of mathematics before they were professors of metaphysics. Sir William Hamilton's collection of instances to prove that mathematicians, as such, are persons of inferior intelligence, only shows that some of the time which he directed to developing his New Analytic, and to thinking out the quantification of the predicate, might have been profitably devoted to the study of Mr. Mill's chapters on the logic of induction, and the nature and conditions of proof. His philosophical argument is not a whit stronger than his historic evidence. Mathematical truth depends upon intuition and reasoning from intuition. "The mere act of intellect," says Sir William Hamilton, "which an act of intuition determines is of all mental energies the feeblest." It follows from this statement that when Newton, as a boy, saw the self-evident truth of the most difficult propositions of Euclid on reading the statement of them, as clearly as if they were axioms, the mental energy which he exhibited was typically feeble. The contemplation which we attribute to the Divine Mind, as its intellectual essence, of the sum of things in their simultaneous relations to each other, and of effects in their causes, being

intuitive, is, on Sir William Hamilton's theory, of a lower order than the painful struggle by which finite intelligences press on from the known to the unknown. Though the relation of the human mind to the universe is not that of the microcosm to the macrocosm, human knowledge surely approaches perfection in the degree in which this fancy is realized. A world framed by measurement and numbers cannot be understood and imaged without that mathematical training and knowledge which Sir William Hamilton lacked and disparaged. That incapacity for affairs, and that ignorance of men, which Sir William Hamilton attributed to mathematicians, belong to them rather as students and abstract thinkers than as students of a particular subject dealing with abstractions of a special order. He has failed to prove, what in the nature of things scarcely admits of rigid proof, and therefore should not have been asserted, that they are at once the most unreasonably sceptical and the most childishly credulous of men. There have been non-mathematical system-builders as extravagant as M. Comte, upon whose mathematics, by the way, though he was stronger in that than in any special science, Arago threw contempt. In spite of M. Michel Chasles, antiquaries and scholars, whose dealings are not with demonstrative but with contingent and probable matter, have usually been as easy dupes as any other class of men. The oscillations of literary and historic criticism are a patent exhibition of the two opposite extravagances of credulity and incredulity which Sir William Hamilton held to be the special vice of mathematical training. The poems of Rowley, the tragedy of Vortigern, the works of Ossian, the island of Formosa, the upas-tree of Java, and the drinking-horn of Hardicanute, are a few of many instances which prevent the helmet of Mambrino and the stone discovered by Mr. Pickwick, on which Bill Stumps had traced his mark, from being set down as extravagant caricatures.

DOMESTIC SERVANTS.

AMONGST the good old commonplace controversies which it seems impossible to get satisfactorily laid to rest is the venerable discussion as to the badness of domestic servants. We do not pretend to sufficient antiquarian knowledge to be able to say off-hand when the complaint first became common. Probably, if we may venture a guess, it was about the period when domestic service began to be substituted for slavery; and it will most likely continue till the arrival of the day when our floors will be scrubbed and our dinners served by machinery. The ladies of that period will have to grumble at the defective arrangements of the joints and levers of the steam housemaid, and will send for the engineer to put her to rights; but we dare say that they will converse in much the same spirit as is now common, and as prevailed in former days, when the lady of the house might order an inefficient menial to be flogged to death, and have another bought in his place. Meanwhile the discussion has just come up in a rather unusual form. Mr. Morley has published a letter, in the last number of the *Fortnightly Review*, to those officious ladies who have undertaken the repeal of the Contagious Diseases Act. With a great deal of what he says to them we heartily concur, and we admire the point and vigour of the rebuke which he administers. But having given them a very satisfactory piece of his mind, he proceeds to unburden himself upon some allied topics. He sets forth some of the causes of the Social Evil, and amongst them is the treatment generally bestowed upon servants. We treat these unfortunate human beings, who sleep under our roofs and have a share in our meals, as though they were not much higher than our dogs, and a little better than our horses. Closely connected with them as we are, we pay no attention to their moral or mental development, and we must not wonder if they fall a prey to the dangers which are always surrounding them. More than this, he appeals to the ladies of the Association to know whether they have not with their own eyes seen such a scandal as this—the young man of the house lounging over his newspaper whilst the maid-servant is carrying the coal-scuttle upstairs. We have no right to speak on behalf of the ladies thus invoked; but we should imagine that, if they speak frankly, they will admit that they have seen such a sight. Possibly they may add that, however regrettable it may be in the eyes of a philosopher, its evil influence upon morality is not quite so obvious. If the wicked young gentleman insisted upon dropping his newspaper and helping the maid-servant, it is at least an open question whether the danger to morality would be increased or diminished. Mr. Morley, however, warms with his subject. He proceeds to speak of the poor dressmaker, kept up to late hours of the night to earn a miserable pittance scarcely sufficient to keep body and soul together. Whilst there is such poverty, he says (and with much force), the evils denounced will continue to exist. But he goes further; he seems to think it almost better that they should exist. It is not more demoralizing, he declares, for a woman to sacrifice her life to the vices of man than to the “monstrous vanity” of ladies. This is, we must confess, rather a startling proposition. A poor milliner starving or half-starving on a shilling a day is a most proper object for pity; but after all she may, and sometimes does, lead a pure and ennobling life. If she is honest, virtuous, and kind, she may be an ornament to the world, though a victim to the present conditions of society. This is not quite possible in the other case. Mr. Morley's argument seems to assume that the person sacrificed to the vanity of women is in

some sense an accomplice in their evil-doing. Surely this is a rash assumption. A painter who labours all day at an ill-paid picture may be administering to the pride of some selfish and purse proud collector, but his own life may be a model of every virtue. The case of the woman who makes dresses is precisely the same. She is doing no wrong, and is setting such an example as she can of honest industry. The comparison seems to be merely verbal. The seducer necessarily degrades his victim. The fine lady, at the very worst, consents to her working under conditions unfavourable to morality; and it is rather difficult to see how, by ordering a dress, she makes her position worse. *Prima facie*, she appears to be simply increasing the demand for labour; and though political economists may dispute the accuracy of this assertion, there is at any rate a wide difference between ordering a new dress without taking proper care that certain incidental ill consequences shall not arise, and unequivocally encouraging a woman to enter a necessarily debasing condition of life. One action may possibly conduce to an unhealthy state of things, which again is indirectly conducive to bringing about that result which is the necessary and direct consequence of the other action. It is a confusion of all plain views of morality to denounce the two as if they were the same. Extravagance of this kind defeats its own object.

However, we will leave Mr. Morley to clear up his rather dark sayings upon this head, and return to the question of domestic servants. What is the plain truth of the matter? The present conditions of domestic service are, says Mr. Morley, favourable to immorality, and that chiefly because ladies don't attend properly to their maids, and young men don't help them to carry coal-scuttles. With certain limitations we need not dispute the proposition; but the explanation requires to be looked into before we can admit its validity. The reasons usually given may serve to bring out the facts of the case. As matters are, a great many young women are leading a very independent life, moving about from one family to another, and with strong motives for not marrying. It is a natural consequence that a certain proportion of them fall into evil courses. We do not know what the numbers may be, or whether, as a fact, the morality prevalent in this class is much better or worse than that of persons in the same rank elsewhere. Assuming, however, that the morality is not so good as might be wished, how are we to set about improving it? The fault, according to Mr. Morley, lies principally with the vain and frivolous fine ladies who do not recognise a common humanity between themselves and their inferiors. They ought to give their dependents good advice, and to put some menial duties upon the younger members of their families. We of course should not object to the existence of a more friendly feeling in this respect, and Mr. Morley is only following Mr. Mill and other writers of his school in making the suggestion. But what are the difficulties to be encountered? Why is there this absence of friendly feeling, and is it the fault of the fine ladies, or in an equal degree of the servants themselves? Let us suppose, for example, that some enthusiastic family introduces the innovation, and that the young gentlemen let the maid-servants improve their minds with the *Times* whilst their masters are carrying up the coals, and laying the cloth for breakfast. The consequences, we imagine, would be singularly unpleasant to everybody concerned. Dr. Johnson once invited Mrs. Macaulay to put her democratic principles in practice, by asking John Thomas to sit down to dinner. The lady might have had something to say against his logic; but the test is one which Mr. Morley seems ready to accept. Now, in the first place, the maid has been hired to carry coal-scuttles; there is nothing in the smallest degree debasing about the practice, or degrading to the dignity of human nature. She can do it quite as well as her young master, and without wasting time which ought to be valuable. On the other hand, she does not care about the *Times*; she has no opinions about Irish landlords, and she will be perfectly content with a few scraps of intelligence from a Sunday newspaper, when she has earned an hour or two of rest at the end of the week. Why should we put our razors to cut blocks and invite the kitchen chopper to come up and do the shaving? In the next place both Sarah Ann and John Thomas will feel themselves exquisitely uncomfortable, and make everybody else as uncomfortable as they are, in the society of the drawing-room. Both sets of inhabitants may be very good people, but they live in different worlds, have different subjects of interest, and, though on excellent terms when they meet, are not calculated for close intimacy. Between the two there is a great gulf fixed, and an attempt forcibly to bridge it over would only end in remarkable discomfort. We feel quite unable to say what would be the effects upon morality.

To all this Mr. Morley might probably agree, but he would add that this is precisely the grievance of which he complains. He wants to get rid of the gulf, and to establish, if not an equality, a closer relation between masters and servants. To this we must reply that, whilst things are as we have described, it seems rather hard to blame individuals or classes on either side of the line. The ladies are not more accountable than the maids. They are mutually unfit for very close intimacy with each other. A lady who chose to break through the tacitly accepted code which regulates the intercourse would be told in very intelligible terms to mind her own business, and not to pry into what does not concern her. As a matter of fact, we believe that most ladies wish to see their servants comfortable, sufficiently fed and clothed, and with a sufficient amount of leisure for their religious duties and occasional amusements. If they try to go much further, and to undertake

the moral and intellectual supervision of their dependents, they are apt to find that they are regarded as officious and meddling. Service has become to a considerable extent a purely commercial relation, and has undergone the same change as that which has affected the position of manufacturers relatively to their artisans. There were certain advantages about the old system which we have irrecoverably lost. It was in many ways pleasanter when workmen were part of the employer's family, and took a personal interest in the success of his trade. It was pleasanter when an innkeeper of the old-fashioned class sat down to table with travellers, and regarded them as guests as much in the social as in the commercial sense. The modern fine gentleman who has nothing to do with you except to make out a bill, and forgets your existence as soon as you have passed his threshold, may sell a better article, but is a much less congenial human being. In like manner the old servant was part of the family, and might be reckoned one degree below a poor relation. The modern servant is a person who is content to take a certain definite sum for discharging stipulated duties, and is distinctly disinclined either to go beyond them or to allow his master to assume the existence of any sentimental feeling of affection, which is utterly irrelevant to commercial considerations. Further, we have the difficulty, here as elsewhere, that we have not yet developed the sentiments which are appropriate to our changed relations. Everybody is jealous of his rights, and does not quite understand what they ought to be. Snobbishness is the product of this feeling in the upper classes, where everybody tries to claim a little more social consideration, and does not quite know whether he has earned it. The uncomfortable feeling which exists between masters and servants is another manifestation of the same principle. We see it in an exaggerated form in a new country, where the raw Irish girl is completely puzzled by her change of condition, and is anxious to prove herself as good as her employer. Everything seems to have been turned upside down, and nobody has thoroughly shaken down into his new position. In time we shall learn to accommodate ourselves to the situation. Servants will become more obliging and masters more civil when it is fully understood that the relation is one of real independence, though of close temporary connexion, and when the suspicion of degradation on one hand and of insolence on the other has had time to die out; possibly we may then be able to meet on different terms from those which are now prevalent, though the differences of education and of social position do not seem to diminish, and the barriers which they oppose may always be a sufficient reason against the coal-scuttle theory.

Meanwhile it seems rather unreasonable to throw all the blame upon one party to the contract. If mistresses are sometimes vain and thoughtless, and there can be no doubt that they frequently err in both directions, servants are constantly unreasonable and fractious. So far as the everlasting complaint has any special meaning at the present day, it means that we are all going through a revolutionary period, for which one class is not more responsible than another. We must make it better by endeavouring to improve people on both sides of the gulf, and not by denouncing the follies of one exclusively, and still less by proposing a spasmodic effort at upsetting the natural order of things, in spite of all prejudices of education and custom. And especially we feel certain that that ingenious recipe of the coal-scuttle could hardly be carried into practice without causing very serious inconvenience.

EPISCOPAL SIGNATURES.

THE harmony of the two Houses of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury was slightly disturbed the other day by an odd question. A document of some kind was sent from the Lower House to the Upper—we say vaguely a document, as we do not profess to have thoroughly mastered the language of Ecclesiastical Synods, whether Œcumenical or only Provincial, and if we rashly called it a *gravamen*, it might turn out to be an *articulus cleri*. Well, the Upper House refused to receive the document, because one member of the Lower House was wrongly described in it. This was no other than the Suffragan Bishop of Nottingham. It is one of the anomalies of the position of a Suffragan Bishop that his Bishopric, as such, gives him no seat in either House of Convocation; only, as Bishop Mackenzie happens to be an Archdeacon, his Archdeaconry gives him a seat in the Lower House. To draw an illustration from temporal matters, he is in somewhat the same position as an Irish Peer, whose peerage gives him no seat in the House of Lords, but who happens to be chosen a member of the House of Commons. The document then sent up from the Lower House was signed by several of its members and amongst others by Bishop Mackenzie, and he signed after the following fashion, "Henry Nottingham, Bishop Suffragan." The Upper House determined that such a description was not a description of anybody, and refused to receive the document.

Now let no one think that we were so wise in our own conceits as to fancy that we knew how a Suffragan Bishop of Nottingham ought to sign himself. We presumed that the thing might be found out. There must, we thought, be precedents. There have been a good many Suffragan Bishops since the passing of the Act of Henry the Eighth, and some signatures of some of them must surely be forthcoming. But till some such signature was produced, following the exact model chosen by Bishop Mackenzie, we were ready provisionally to believe that the Upper

House was quite right in declining to recognise the existence of such a person as "Henry Nottingham, Bishop Suffragan." How much more then must we believe it when we are, in the midst of our musings, told, by an authority which, if a little mysterious, is at any rate very dignified, that our own conclusion was a right one. It seems that certain "arrangements respecting Suffragan Bishops"—it is not said by whom made—"have received the assent of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, after consultation with the Government, and after a full consideration of the subject by the Bishops of both provinces." These are certainly great names, and, if each were acting in a legal way, they would be great authorities. But "assent" on the part of the Archbishops, "full consideration" on the part of the Bishops, "consultation" on the part of the Government—whoever "the Government" may be—hardly amount to a legal enactment of anything. After all, in a matter of titles and precedence, we are not sure that the Earl Marshal and the Heralds are not better entitled to be listened to than Archbishops, Bishops, and Government. Still we will not look a gift horse in the mouth; and, as the Archbishops assent, as the Bishops fully consider, as the Government has been consulted, we should be the last to object to the decision that the proper title is "A. B. Bishop Suffragan of C." We do not know on what grounds these great authorities came to the same conclusion as ourselves. Our own line of thought was something of this kind. A signature, like anything else, ought to be sense and not nonsense, and we ventured to think that the signature "Henry Nottingham, Bishop Suffragan," was nonsense and not sense. The form seems to have been prompted by a notion of imitating the usual signature of a Bishop, and yet of making some distinction between the Suffragan Bishop and his Diocesan. But the Bishop or those who prompted him must have forgotten the real meaning of a Bishop's signature—a further point on which we should like to know the views of Archbishops, Bishops, and Government. We suspect that many people fancy that a Bishop takes the name of his see instead of his surname. Only they sometimes get a little puzzled by one or two words like "Cantuar" and "Ebor," which do not seem to be the names of any places to be found in the map of England. We did indeed once review a poet who spoke of something being done at "Cantuar," evidently thinking that, once upon a time, the city of Canterbury was, in some language or other, known as "Cantuar." And there seems to be a wide-spread belief, especially in the city of York itself, that York was once, in Latin or in some other obsolete tongue, known as "Ebor." Then there is the tale, true or false, of some one who, receiving a letter signed "S. Dunelm," wrote back again to "S. Dunelm, Esq.," a tale which is the ecclesiastical equivalent of the tale of the man who addressed the peer who is a Duke in three kingdoms as "Messrs. Hamilton, Brandon, and Co." The plain truth, which we should have thought that every member of either House of Convocation would have understood, is that all Bishops' signatures are simply contractions. The Bishop does not take the name of his see as his surname, but he signs by an abbreviation of his Latin description. The full form "Willelmus Archiepiscopus Eboracensis" is cut short into "W. Ebor."—though in the seventeenth century the abridged form was a little longer, going the length of "Eborac." So with all the rest; the Latin form used to be always adopted, and latterly the fashion has come in again. Some minds in the Western diocese may perhaps be set at rest when they see the mediæval-looking "F. Exon," taking the place of such a modern innovation as "H. Exeter." But there is nothing in the world to be said against the English form, because it makes sense just as much as the Latin. If "F. Exon" is a correct abbreviation of "Fridericus Episcopus Exoniensis," "H. Exeter" was a no less correct abbreviation of "Henry Bishop of Exeter." The surname is dropped, or, more accurately, it never was there to be dropped; the form of signature which our Bishops still retain dates from days when surnames were not in being.

Now the test whether "Henry Nottingham, Bishop Suffragan" is a proper signature is whether it can be looked on as an abridged form of any fuller signature that makes sense. "Henry Mackenzie, Bishop Suffragan of Nottingham," or "Henry, Bishop Suffragan of Nottingham," would either of them be sense; but the signature which was chosen cannot stand for either of these; if it stands for anything, it must stand for "Henry, Bishop of Nottingham, Bishop Suffragan," which is an absurd repetition. Any one would at once see the absurdity of such a signature as "John London, Bishop," and the proposed Nottingham signature was just as absurd. Two things only, as far as we know, beat it or come near to it. The first personage who was described by others as "Lord Anglican Bishop of Jerusalem" used to sign himself "M. S. Angl. Hieros.," a form which it is not easy to fill up in any language. The ex-Bishop of Bath and Wells used very properly to sign himself "Auckland Bath and Wells," such being clearly the simplest abbreviation of the full description of his temporal and spiritual titles. But some minor official must have been a little bewildered about the matter, as we have seen official acts beginning "We, Auckland, by divine permission, Bishop, &c.," a form which it would have been uncommonly hard to put into Latin.

This last case moves us into another region. How long is it, and why is it, that temporal Peers have taken to drop their Christian names? In Elizabeth's time the signature of a Bishop and the signature of a temporal Peer followed exactly the same pattern. "R. Leicester," "W. Burghley," are constantly added to documents of that age. And the usage seems in itself reasonable.

"R. Leicester" is an obvious contraction of "Robert Earl of Leicester," while it is hard to say what "Leicester" by itself stands for. This last form has most likely been adopted as being more distinctive, less like the signatures of other people. Yet, after all, the Peer does not stand alone in getting rid of his Christian name. To say nothing of the Lord Mayor, who approaches to the nature of a Peer so nearly as to be called Lord and Right Honourable, why does a Clerk of the Peace always adopt the otherwise specially lordly form? There is, to be sure, a sort of solidarity—we believe that is the right word—between the Clerk of the Peace and the Lord Lieutenant—or more accurately, between the Clerk of the Peace and the Custos Rotulorum; there are certain occasions on which one or the other must be present, but it does not matter which; so that the smaller official may have learned to follow the fashions of the greater. Then on the other hand, Peers are, by the nature of the case, driven to cleave to the ancient form, save only in writings liable to be handled about in courts of justice. The retention of the Christian name by a Peer was a small means of distinction between one bearer of the title and another. It gives a little clue to distinguish Earl Thomas from his father Earl Richard. But to judge by the title-pages of noble authors—John Earl Russell and John Lord Campbell are honourable exceptions—the chief object seems to be to hinder any one from knowing which of perhaps a long line of peers is the one intended. When a book is said to be by "the Duke of Argyll" or "the Duke of Manchester," who is to know a hundred years hence which of many successive Dukes is the one with whom we are dealing? Either the authors must act on a latent assumption that their books will not be known or cared for a hundred years hence, or else they must be like that Earl of Buchan who personally identified himself with the Earl of Buchans who had been before him, and who thought it necessary, towards the end of the last century, to explain to an astonished foreigner that he had had no share in the betrayal of Charles the First.

But to return to Bishops and other ecclesiastical potentates, although in another branch of the vineyard, no signature is to us more mysterious than the one of which the familiar type used to be "N. Cardinal Wiseman." "N. Wiseman, Cardinal," would have been as intelligible as "N. Wiseman, Colonel," but what is "N. Cardinal Wiseman"? What language is it? What does it stand for? Can anybody fill it up in Latin or in English? Without further explanation it seems to be very much of a piece with "M. S. Angl. Hieros." and "Henry Nottingham, Bishop Suffragan." It is a little like what one sometimes sees over a shop, "Draper Jenkins Tailor"; and yet it is not quite like it, as the exact analogy would be "William Draper Jenkins."

It is worth noticing that in the great Act of 1258, the Act which some call the first and some the last public document in the English tongue, all the Peers, temporal and spiritual, sign in full, with Christian name, surname, and name of Earldom or Bishopric. Archbishop Boniface alone, as a member of a sovereign house and having no surname, signs "Bonifacius archieps de Cantrebur." "Bonifacius archieps de Cantrebur." The others sign "Gaut. de Cantelou, eveske de Wyrecestre," "Walter de Cantelou, bishop of Wirechestr," and "Simon de Montfort, cunte de Leycestr," in English "Sim. of Muntfort, Earl of Leirechestr." Whether Simon wrote with his own hand one would like to know. At an earlier time, when the man himself—whether he could write or not—made his cross, and the professional scribe added the name and title, it seems often to have been a point of honour to make the description as long as possible, and to make each Earl or Bishop use a style different from that of any of his fellows of the same order. We remember one charter where, every other possible description of a Bishop having been used up, one eccentric prelate appears as "Catascopus." To a naturalist this might suggest the "Catoblepas" or Gnu. But, to keep among things episcopal, does not "Catascopus" exactly describe Mrs. Proudie standing and looking down at the meek Bishop of Barchester—whose signature, by the way, is "T. Barnum"—who, poor man, sits in his chair, venturing least of all things in the world to be himself an "Anascopus"? We do not at this moment remember whether Mr. Trollope anywhere gives the signature of the female Prelate of Barchester. Surely she could not have acquiesced in her simple Christian and surname.

THE SHRIEKING SISTERHOOD.

WE by no means put it forward as an original remark when we say that Nature does her grandest works of construction in silence, and that all great historical reforms have been brought about either by long and quiet preparation, or by sudden and authoritative action. The inference from which is, that no great good has ever been done by shrieking, that much talking necessarily includes a good deal of dilution, and that fuss is never an attribute of strength nor coincident with concentration. Whenever there has been a very deep and sincere desire on the part of a class or an individual to do a thing, it has been done, not talked about, where the desire is only half-hearted, where the judgment or the conscience is not quite clear as to the desirableness of the course proposed, where the chief incentive is love of notoriety and not the intrinsic worth of the action itself—personal *kudos*, and not the good of a cause or the advancement of humanity—then there has been talk, much talk, hysterical excitement, a long and prolonged cackle, and heaven and earth called to witness that an egg has been laid wherein lies the germ

of a future chick—with proper incubation. Necessarily there must be much verbal agitation if any measure is to be carried the fulcrum of which is public opinion. If you have to stir the dry bones you must prophesy to them in a loud voice, and not leave off till they have begun to shake. Things which can only be known by teaching must be spoken of, but things which have to be done are always better done the less the fuss made about them; and the more steadfast the action, the less noisy the agent. Purpose is apt to exhale itself in protestations, and strength is sure to exhaust itself by a flux of words. But at the present day what Mr. Carlyle calls the Silences are the least honoured of all the minor gods, and the babble of small beginnings threatens to become intolerable. We all "think outside our brains," and the result is not conducive to mental vigour. It is as if we were to set a plant to grow with its heels in the air, and then look for roots, flowers, and fruit, all by the same process of excitation and disclosure.

One of our quarrels with the Advanced Women of our generation is the hysterical parade they make about their wants and their intentions. It never seems to occur to them that the best means of getting what they want is to take it, when not forbidden by the law—to act, not to talk; that all this running hither and thither over the face of the earth, and feverish unrest, and loud acclaim is but the dilution of purpose through much speaking, and not the right way at all; and that to hold their tongues and do would advance them by as many leagues as babble puts them back. A small knot of women, "terribly in earnest," could move multitudes by the silent force of example. One woman alone, quietly taking her life in her own hands, and working out the great problem of self-help and independence practically, not merely stating it theoretically, is worth a score of shrieking sisters frantically calling on men and gods to see them make an effort to stand upright without support, with interludes of reproach to men for the want of help in their attempt. The silent woman who quietly calculates her chances and measures her powers with her difficulties so as to avoid the probability of a *fiasco*, and who therefore achieves a success according to her endeavour, does more for the real emancipation of her sex than any amount of pamphleteering, lecturing, or petitioning by the shrieking sisterhood can do. Hers is deed not declamation, proof not theory, and it carries with it the respect always accorded to success.

And really if we think of it dispassionately, and carefully dissect the great mosaic of hindrances which women say makes up the pavement of their lives, there is very little which they may not do if they like—and can. They have already succeeded to a great extent in opening to themselves the practice of medicine, for one thing, and this is an immense opening if they know how to use it. A few pioneers, unhelped for the most part, steadily, and without shrieking, stormed the barricades of the hospitals and dissecting-rooms, heroically bearing the shower of hard-mouthed missiles with which they were pelted, and successfully forcing their way notwithstanding. But the most successful of them are those who held on with least excitement, and who strove more than they declaimed; while others, by constitution belonging to the shrieking sisterhood, have comparatively failed, and have mainly succeeded in making themselves ridiculous. After some pressure, but very little cackle—for here too the work was wanted, the desire real, and the workers in earnest—female colleges on a liberal and extended system of education have been established, and young women have now an opportunity of showing what they can do in brain work. It is no longer by the niggardliness of men and the fault of an imperfect system if they prove intellectually inferior to the stronger sex; they have their dynamometer set up for them, and all they have to do is to register their relative strength, and abide the issue. All commerce, outside the Stock Exchange, is open to them equally with men; and there is nothing to prevent their becoming merchants, as they are now petty traders, or setting up as bill-brokers, commission agents, or even bankers; which last profession, according to a contemporary, they have actually adopted in New York, some ladies there having established a bank, which, so far as they have yet gone, they are said to conduct with deftness and ready arithmetic. In literature they have competitors in men, but no monopolists. Indeed, they themselves have become almost the monopolists of the whole section of "light literature" and fiction; while nothing but absolute physical and mental incapacity prevents their taking the charge of a journal, and working it with female editor, sub-editor, manager, reporters, compositors, and even news-girls to sell the second edition at omnibus doors and railway stations. If a set of women chose to establish a newspaper, and work it amongst themselves, not a single law could be brought to bear against them; and if they made it as philosophical as some, or as gushing as others, they might enter into a formidable rivalry with the old-established; they would have a fair hearing, or rather reading, they would not be "nursed" or hustled, and they would get just as much success as they deserved. To be sure, they do not yet sit on the Bench nor plead at the Bar; they are not in Parliament, and they are not even voters; while, as married women with unfriendly husbands and no protection order, they have something to complain of, and wrongs that are in a fair way of being righted if the shrieking sisterhood does not frighten the world prematurely. But, despite these restrictions, they have a very wide circle wherein they can display their power, and with the world with noble deeds, if they choose—and as some have chosen.

Of the representative "working-women" in England, we find none who have shrieked on platforms or made an hysterical parade

of their work. Quietly, and with the dignity which comes by self-respect and the consciousness of strength, they have done what it was in their hearts to do, leaving the world to find out the value of their labours, and to applaud or deride their independence. Mrs. Somerville asked no man's leave to study science and make herself a distinguished name as the result, nor did she find the need of any more special organization than what the best books, a free press, and first-rate available teaching offered. Miss Martineau dived with more or less success into the forbidding depths of the "dismal science," at a time when political economy was shirked by men, and considered as essentially unfeminine as top-boots and tobacco; and she was confessedly an advanced Liberal when to be a high Tory was part of the whole duty of woman. Miss Nightingale undertook the care of wounded soldiers without any more publicity than was absolutely necessary for the organization of her staff, and with not so much as one shriek. Rosa Bonheur laughed at those who told her that animal painting was unwomanly, and that she had better restrict herself to flowers and heads, as became the *jeune demoiselle* of conventional life; but she did not publish her programme of independence, nor take the world into her confidence, and tell them of her difficulties and defiance. The Lady Superintendents of our own various sisterhoods have organized their communities and performed their works of charity with very faint blare of trumpets indeed; and we might enumerate many more who have quietly lived the life of action and independence of which others have only raved, and who have done while their sisters shrieked. These are the women to be respected, whether we sympathize with their line of action or not, having shown themselves to be true workers, capable of sustained effort, and therefore worthy of the honour which belongs to strength and endurance.

Of one thing women may be very sure, though they invariably deny it; the world is glad to take good work from whomsoever will supply it. The most certain patent of success is to deserve it; and if women will prove that they can do the world's work as well as men, they will share with them in the labour and the reward, and if they do it better they will distance them. The appropriation of fields of labour is not so much a question of selfishness as of (hitherto) proved fitness; but if in times to come women can show better harvesting than men, can turn out more finished, more perfected results of any kind, the world's custom will flow to them by the very force of natural law, and they will have the most to do of that which they can do the best. If they wish to educate public opinion to accept them as equals with men, they can only do so by demonstration, not by shrieks. Even men, who are supposed to inherit the earth and to possess all the good things of life, have to do the same thing. Every young man yet untried is only in the position of every woman; and, granting that he has not the deadweight of precedent and prejudice against him, he yet has to win his spurs before he can wear them. But women want theirs given to them without winning, and, moreover, ask to be taught how to wear them when they have got them. They want to be received as masters before they have served their apprenticeship, and to be put into office without passing an examination or submitting to competition. They scream out for a clear stage and favour superadded; and they ask men to shackle their own feet, like Lightfoot in the fairy tale, that they may then be handicapped to a more equal running. They do not remember that their very demand for help vitiates their claim to equality; and that if they were what they assume to be, they would simply take without leave asked or given, and work out their own social salvation by the irresistible force of a concentrated will and in the silence of conscious strength. While the shrieking sisterhood remain to the front, the world will stop its ears, and for every hysterical advocate "the cause" loses a rational adherent and gains a disgusted opponent. It is our very desire to see women happy, noble, fitly employed, and well remunerated for such work as they can do, which makes us so indignant with the foolish among them who obscure the question they pretend to elucidate, and put back the cause which they say they advance. The earnest and practical workers among women are a very different class from the shriekers; but we wish the world could dissociate them more clearly than it does at present, and discriminate between them, both in its censure and its praise.

THE PROSPECTS OF THE EDUCATION BILL.

THE favour accorded to the Education Bill on the occasion of its introduction into the House of Commons has been a good deal qualified in the interval between the first and second readings. As regards the Education League, it is hardly too much to say that the more they look at it the less they seem to like it. The Manchester Committee are less pronounced in their opposition, but even they propose to amend the Bill in one essential feature. The Education Union are, on the whole, satisfied; at least they confine their criticisms to a matter which, in comparison with some others, may be regarded as one of detail. An examination of the several objections urged against the measure by these three bodies will enable us to forecast with tolerable accuracy the kind of reception it is likely to encounter in Committee.

We begin with the Education Union, as being the most friendly to the Bill. From the proceedings of the Central Executive Committee yesterday week it appears that the provision which most excites their hostility is that authorising the direct compulsion of parents. As, however, they are willing to permit

this in the case of children found wandering in the streets, or who are not at work, as well as in the case of those who do not come under the provisions of the Factory and Workshop Acts, or whose parents are receiving parochial relief or are unable to pay the school fees, it is to be supposed that their objections are directed rather against the practicability than against the principle of direct compulsion. However this may be, we entertain no doubt that the Government are right and the Education Union wrong. That there are great difficulties in the way of bringing compulsion to bear on parents we are well aware, but they are not comparable with the difficulties in the way of bringing it to bear on employers. If there were any scarcity of labour the case might be different, but, as things are, the result of making the employer universally responsible for the education of all children employed by him who are within the school age would for the most part be the immediate substitution of older workers. So long as there are labourers over twelve to be had for the asking, to prohibit the employment of children below that age, except under prescribed educational conditions, may hinder them from earning wages, but it will not ensure their being educated. Nor is it an unimportant argument against indirect compulsion that it lays the burden on the wrong shoulders. It is the duty of the parent to give a child education, and it is not the duty of the employer. So long as the law leaves the parent free to discharge this duty or to neglect it, there is a clear inconsistency in insisting upon its being discharged by other people. But though in the matter of compulsion the Government is right as against the Union, it is wrong as against the League and the Manchester Committee. Permissive compulsion has absolutely nothing to recommend it. The permission is certain not to be taken advantage of in those districts which have most need of such a remedy. A low standard of education in the class to which compulsion is to be applied will usually be accompanied by a low estimate of education in the class charged with the application of it, and to leave to illiterate farmers the determination whether or not to compel illiterate peasants to send their children to school is merely a roundabout way of saying that compulsion shall not be resorted to except in the great towns. Upon this part of the Bill the Liberal party will have the Government on their side, provided they are sufficiently united to sustain Mr. Forster in adopting an amendment which shall make it obligatory on every School Board, and on the parish or borough officials where there is no School Board, to see that every child in the district receives somehow the necessary minimum of education.

The most important of the other amendments which the Manchester Education Committee are desirous of introducing into the Bill is the insertion of a clause prohibiting Denominational teaching in schools provided by School Boards. This point is now taken out of their hands by Mr. Dixon's announcement that he will move a resolution to this purport on the occasion of the Second Reading of the Bill. For convenience' sake, however, we shall treat it as the amendment of the Manchester Committee rather than of the League, inasmuch as the latter have a further objection to the Bill which is not shared with any other body. In spite of the reasons adduced by Mr. Forster in favour of the contrary proposal, we are of opinion that the Opposition has the best of the argument. If the religious teaching in these new schools is to depend upon the theological complexion of the School Board, the composition of the body which elects the School Board will often excite very keen interest and give occasion to much hard fighting. It is not desirable that a seat in the town council or the parish vestry should be the prize of orthodoxy or heterodoxy, instead of falling to the candidate of greatest business capacity; but it is extremely likely to become so if denominations are at all equally balanced in the community, and if a religious revolution in the School Board hangs upon the triumph of one or other at the municipal or parochial elections. And what, after all, is to be the compensation for this mischief? The diffusion of religious education in no way depends on it, for wherever any denomination is strong enough in the district to command a majority in the School Board, it will be able to attain the same end in a better way, by assisting voluntary Denominational schools. The only class of schools which are likely to benefit by the permission to School Boards to determine what religion shall be taught in such new schools as they provide, are the schools whose religion consists in reading a chapter from the Bible at the beginning of the day's business. As to the religious influence supposed to be exerted on the children by this process, we are absolute disbelievers, and we are not therefore disposed to encounter a real danger in return for an imaginary advantage. Indeed, our conviction is that the interests of Denominational education will, in the long run, be promoted by the exclusion from schools established by the School Boards of any religious instruction, except out of school hours.

The special point upon which the League are at issue with the Government remains to be considered. The League agree with the Manchester Education Committee in holding that compulsion should be obligatory and universal, and that religion should be excluded from schools provided by the School Boards. But they go, if we understand them rightly, far beyond this, and insist that no public money shall be given to any school which does not submit to the same restriction. No Denominational school must receive assistance from the School Boards, nor, we presume, be any longer entitled to a share in the Parliamentary grant. We are not quite certain as to this latter limitation, since, in his last interview with Mr. Gladstone on Wednesday, Mr. Dixon used the terms

"State aid" and "aid from the rates" as though they were strictly synonymous. But the remarks of Mr. Vince, another member of the same deputation, clearly point to the exclusion of Denominational schools from public assistance of any kind. He is reported as saying that "there is no conscience clause for ratepayers," and that "the time has arrived when one man will not allow himself to be taxed for another man's religion." This argument seems to be a favourite one with the members of the Education League, and they clench it by comparing the education-rate—supposing it to be laid out in assisting Denominational schools—with the church-rate, now happily abolished. On the whole this analogy strikes us as the least pertinent that it has ever been our misfortune to come across. The things compared have absolutely nothing in common. The object of church-rates was the support of religious worship coupled with direct and exclusive religious teaching. The object of an education-rate, so far as it is spent in assisting Denominational schools, is the promotion of secular education through the agency of religious persons. Suppose it were found expedient—and though not probable, it is at least conceivable—to distribute poor relief by the hands of the ministers of the several denominations, this would not in the least assimilate the poor-rate to a church-rate. And a rate for assisting Denominational teachers to give the best available secular instruction to the children under their charge has just the same amount of resemblance, and no more. The views entertained by the League upon this part of the Government measure are altogether irreconcilable with making any use of the immense educational machinery now in operation throughout the country. In every parish in England and Wales a new secular school must be set up, no matter how extensive may be the previous provision of Denominational schools, or how complete the protection afforded to parental scruples by a stringent conscience clause. It is hard to say whether the wanton waste of public money, or the thankless disregard of all that has been done by voluntary effort, is most conspicuous in their modest proposal.

Upon the whole, therefore, the amendments suggested by the Manchester Education Committee are those which we desire to see incorporated into the Bill. The substitution of indirect for direct compulsion proposed by the Education Union would be distinctly a step backwards; while the secularization of all schools supported by public money insisted on by the League would be as disastrous in its results as it is erroneous in principle.

MONTALEMBERT ON THE REVIVAL OF GALLICANISM.

THE fierce philippic of the "venerable" Bishop of Laval, to which we called attention last week in illustration of the alleged perfect concord among the assembled episcopate, has not been suffered to pass unchallenged by his colleagues. The Bishop of Montpensier, writing from Rome to the *Français*, after observing that he had waited in hope that the letter would be disclaimed as a forgery, summarily designates it as "an outrage on the Bishop of Orleans" and "an assault on the liberty of the Council, which ought to be left entirely free and exempt from all pressure from any quarter whatever." Nor has Father Gratry's exposure of the condemned heresies of Pope Honorius and assertion of Gallican principles failed to attract notice in high quarters. The Bishop of Strasburg, who seems to have a strong affinity to his fiery brother of Laval, not content with denouncing Gratry in no measured terms as a heretic, proceeds, very discreetly, not to answer him, but to forbid the clergy and faithful of his diocese to read his letters to Mgr. Deschamps, or anything he may hereafter write. On the other hand, Strossmayer assures his "dear brother in our Saviour" that he has read with profound joy his "defence of the glorious Bishop of Orleans against the unjust attacks of other bishops"; and the Bishop of St. Brieux, in thanking him for his timely and "signal service to religion and the Church," observes that "the evil is so great and the danger so fearful that silence would be complicity," adding significantly, "You must expect every kind of outrage, for this is the lot of truth in the face of passion." The same sharp division of adverse parties betrays itself, as we have before now pointed out, in the English Roman Catholic press. Only last week a long epistle appears in the *Weekly Register* from the infallibilist editor of the *Tablet*, full of the insolent self-assertion and contemptuous abuse of all dissentients which are characteristic of his school. This is immediately followed by a calm but very decided letter in quite another style, from a well-known priest of considerable standing, who insists that a large number of both clergy and laity, "men of position, who have shown their zeal for the Church by spending themselves, and being spent, in her service, are unmistakeably opposed" to the new dogma; many because they themselves think it "in clear contradiction to the facts of history," others from the fear that it will at least appear to outsiders a conclusive evidence against the claims of Catholicism from the extreme difficulty of reconciling it with history. The writer adds that the tone of the Ultramontane press, which stigmatizes all opponents of the doctrine "as sensationalists and disaffected to the Church," has greatly helped to discredit it. By far the most remarkable recent contribution to the controversy, however, alike from its contents, its circumstances, and the position and antecedents of the writer, is the letter from the veteran champion of Catholicism, Count Montalembert, which appeared in the *Times* of Monday last, and to this we shall now direct the attention of our readers.

Count Montalembert himself is too well known to require any introduction. But we may observe that for several years he has been suffering under a painful and incurable malady, looking, as he said not long ago, in the face of death, and longing for the release which is still delayed. All the solemnity peculiar to a deathbed profession of belief attaches to whatever he now writes. No doubt a suspicion is sometimes felt about dying confessions of faith or repentance, extracted when bodily pain and the dread of approaching dissolution may have weakened the judgment, and reduced reason to be the slave of an almost physical terror. If Victor Emmanuel had the other day consented, as he did not, to purchase the last sacraments by repudiating the policy of a lifetime, nobody would have attached very much weight to his professed change of view. But when an ardent monk and preacher like Lacordaire dies with a profession of "impenitent liberalism" on his lips, the occasion of its utterance is an additional pledge of the reality and depth of his convictions. And so with Count Montalembert's letter. Had he written now to repudiate the liberal opinions he has so constantly proclaimed, we might have respected his sincerity, but should hardly have accounted a recantation extorted under fear of impending death the most trustworthy utterance of his unbiassed judgment. But he has done just the contrary. He writes, not to repudiate, but to reaffirm more emphatically than ever, the anti-Ultramontane principles which he has always substantially held and avowed. The letter is addressed to a correspondent who had charged him with inconsistency in now maintaining Gallican principles and expressing his approval of Father Gratry's Letter to the Archbishop of Malines, whereas in 1847 he had spoken of Gallicanism as a defunct error. The gist of his reply is in precise accordance with a recent comment of our own on the strange paradoxes of Archbishop Manning's last Pastoral. Gallicanism is of two kinds; or rather two wholly distinct lines of thought came to be comprehended under a common term. The fashionable Gallicanism of the *ancien régime* practically substituted a lay Pope in the King of France—quite as dogmatic and quite as intolerant as the Pope of Rome—for the legitimate authority whether of the Holy See or the Episcopate. It was, in short, a sort of high Tory Erastianism. This was the Gallicanism which Montalembert formerly scouted as a "mummy," and of which Count Daru said the other day, "You are mistaking the century." This Gallicanism is a thing of the past. It died out with the absolute monarchy of the later Bourbons to which it owed its origin and its meaning. Theological Gallicanism—that is, the appeal to the constitutional precedents and rights of the ancient Church against the encroachments of a usurping Papalism—is a very different affair. It is in substance, though not in name, as old as the usurpations against which it is directed, and is only so far a speciality of any one country that France was for a long time the most strenuous champion of ecclesiastical freedom against Papal autocracy. This Gallicanism, Count Montalembert assures us from his death-bed, he has never repudiated, nor ever accepted the Ultramontanism it opposes. If he once adopted the name, it was only as a protest against Erastian encroachments, not at all in the sense of "the doctrines or pretensions of the Ultramontanes of the present day." His disclaimer of any such tendencies is indeed exceptionally solemn and energetic. "Never, thank Heaven, have I thought, said, or written anything favourable to the separate and personal infallibility of the Pope . . . nor to the theocracy, the dictatorship of the Church . . . nor to that absolutism of Rome which I disputed the existence of, even in the middle ages, in the speech you quoted, but which to day forms the symbol and programme of the party dominant among us." He had formerly said that Gallicanism was dead, and only needed to be buried, because it had made itself the servant of the State. And he still thinks that he spoke correctly. But Gallicanism has risen again. And why? "I do not hesitate to reply. In consequence of the lavish encouragement given, under the Pontificate of Pius IX., to exaggerated doctrines, outraging the good sense as well as the honour of the human race." Of this he had perceived no "coming shadow" in 1847, and had therefore not felt the need of a protest against that spiritual despotism, the system of absolute monarchy, which he had always detested in the State, and which inspires him with no less repugnance in the Church:—

But, in 1847, what could give rise to a suspicion that the Pontificate of Pius IX., acclaimed by all the Liberals of the two worlds, would become the Pontificate represented and personified by the *Univers* and the *Civiltà*? In the midst of the unanimous cries then uttered by the clergy in favour of liberty as in Belgium, of liberty in everything and for all, how could we foresee as possible the incredible wheelabout of almost all that same clergy in 1852—the enthusiasm of most of the Ultramontane doctors for the revival of Caesarism? The harangues of Monseigneur Paris, the charges of Monseigneur de Salinis, and especially the permanent triumph of those lay theologians of absolutism who began by squandering all our liberties, all our principles, all our former ideas, before Napoleon III., and afterwards immolated justice and truth, reason and history, in one great holocaust to the idol they raised up for themselves at the Vatican?

Considering that the Ultramontane reaction, begun many years earlier in his own country by Lamennais and De Maistre, was then in full swing, though its chief author had already become a professed unbeliever, we cannot but think that the Count's foresight was somewhat at fault here. But that does not of course prejudice his claim to consistency. His eyes were opened soon afterwards.

It will be observed that Count Montalembert speaks of "the idol at the Vatican." He is careful to explain that the word is deliberately chosen, and that he owes it to Mgr. Sibour, the Archbishop of Paris, who succeeded the saintly Affré, murdered on the

barricades in 1848, and who was himself not long afterwards the victim of a priestly assassin. In 1853 the Archbishop wrote to him that the new Ultramontane school leads to a double idolatry, of the temporal and the spiritual power. The old Ultramontanes remembered, what the modern school willingly forgets, that "the Pope and the Emperor are not one the whole Church, the other the whole State." The Archbishop adds that such systems might be despised, if they were not calculated to compromise the most serious religious interests, both present and future. "But when one has a presentiment of the evils they are preparing for us, it is difficult to be silent and resigned. You have therefore done well, M. le Comte, to stigmatize them." And, accordingly, Montalembert adds, after citing these pregnant words of "the pastor of the vastest diocese in Christendom"—London, we may observe, is still larger—that he began, not to-day, but eighteen years ago, to combat "the detestable political and religious aberrations which make up contemporary Ultramontanism." There is no real contrast, but only a verbal difference, between his Ultramontanism of 1847 and his Gallicanism of 1870. The concluding paragraph of the letter deserves to be quoted entire. It is now made clear, beyond possibility of dispute, that every single name of first-rate eminence among the hierarchy, the clergy, and the laity of the Roman Catholic Church is inscribed on the banners of the Opposition. It does not follow that they will triumph in the Council; but all honour is due to the brave and faithful minority who fight on so resolutely, under a perfect hailstorm of orthodox abuse and anathemas, in defence of the highest interests and most sacred liberties of their Church. Such words as the following will evoke an echo just now as well in the Council Hall of the Vatican as throughout the length and breadth of Catholic Christendom:—

Therefore, without having either the will or the power to discuss the question now debating in the Council, I hail with the most grateful admiration, first, the great and generous Bishop of Orleans, then the eloquent and intrepid priests who have had the courage to place themselves across the path of the torrent of adulation, imposture, and servility by which we risk being swallowed up. Thanks to them, Catholic France will not have remained too much below Germany, Hungary, and America. I publicly pride myself, and more than I can express by words, on having them for friends and for brother academicians. I have but one regret, that of being prevented by illness from descending into the arena in their suite, not, certainly, on the ground of theology, but on that of history and of the social and political consequences of the system they contend against. Thus should I deserve my share (and it is the only ambition remaining to me) in those *litaines of abuse* daily launched against my illustrious friends by a too numerous portion of that poor clergy which prepares for itself so sad a destiny, and which I formerly loved, defended, and honoured as it had not yet been by any in modern France.

The *Civiltà Cattolica* winds up an elaborate onslaught on Dollinger's recent exposure of the Infaliblist address by a highly characteristic sneer at his "advanced age," and a broad hint that it will fare ill with him if he appears before the judgment seat of Christ as the impenitent assailant of the infallibility of His earthly representative. What the Jesuit organ will say of Count Montalembert's dying utterance we scarcely dare surmise. But outbursts of impotent passion are the last resource of a cause which has become hopeless in the eye of reason. If the latest reports are accurate, the *Schema de Pontifice* containing the obnoxious dogma has already been distributed among the Fathers at Rome, and the French Government has replied by formally demanding the admission of an ambassador at the Council, a right which is said to be guaranteed to France by the Concordat. If this be true—and there seems no reason for doubting it—we may either expect to see a speedy prorogation of the Council, in order to evade the unwelcome demand, or the critical day "big with the fate of" Pius "and of Rome" is at hand. We are come to the beginning of the end.

THE TREATMENT OF LUNATICS.

THE improved treatment of lunatics has been considered one of the most valuable results of the civilization of the nineteenth century, and it is disappointing to find that this result is very far from being certainly attained. The attendants at lunatic asylums must be in great part uneducated, and it appears that there is the same disposition in the more ignorant portion of Englishmen to ill-treat pauper lunatics as to punish horses. The manager of a lunatic asylum is like a gentleman who keeps a large stable. He cannot feel sure that the good effects of his own gentleness and intelligence are not neutralized by stupidity and brutality when his back is turned. Indeed, the danger is greater in the former case than in the latter, because, to say the truth, lunatics are capable of being much more irritating to their attendants than horses. The difficulty is to say whether lunatics are more liable to ill-treatment as single patients in private houses or in asylums. There is in an asylum the security of system and superintendence; but, on the other hand, there is danger of misbehaviour of attendants escaping the utmost vigilance of a manager, and, besides, among many attendants there are likely to be some whose natural brutality is concealed but not controlled by the system under which they serve. The single patients, however, are liable to almost uncontrolled brutality, and also to ill-treatment inflicted under the honest belief that it is beneficial. Considering that persons who passed for scientific maintained in the last century the utility of severity it is not wonderful that uneducated and unrefined persons in our own day should hold an opinion which they think is not only well-founded but convenient. The possession of uncontrolled power has a tendency to convert even an originally

well-meaning person into a tyrant, and therefore it is right that the penalties imposed by law on the unauthorised and uncontrolled detention of lunatics in private houses should be rigorously enforced. But notwithstanding all the vigilance and severity of the administrators of the law, cases of such detention are not unfrequent. Some of them perhaps arise from the hope of gain, and others from aversion to incur trouble or expense. Even where the detention is authorised, and is controlled by regular visitation, there is great scope for harsh or injudicious treatment, especially when the patient is poor and the friends or relations are coarse and ignorant. It has been thought desirable to avoid as far as possible the risk of maltreatment of the humbler class of lunatics by collecting them in the asylums which have been built all over England at considerable expense, but it appears that in a crowd there is almost as much danger as in solitude. A patient was admitted into the Lancaster Lunatic Asylum on the 15th of December last, and he died on the 26th. A *post mortem* examination disclosed two broad bruises across his body—one across his belly, measuring nearly two feet, and the other across his chest. On each side six ribs were found to be broken outwards, and on the right side three of the ribs were broken in two places. He died from inflammation of the pleura caused by these injuries. If this was all that a lunatic asylum could do for him in the way of protection, he might as well have been left in a workhouse or under private care. The chains and whip which were part of the old barbarous system did not kill the patient nor allow him to kill himself. Even the steel coat of which we have read in descriptions of asylums of the last century had at least this advantage, that a patient who wore it could not be jumped upon by his keepers. The only alternative to the supposition of violence to this lunatic by his keepers is the suggestion, which appears somewhat violent, that he may have tumbled out of or against his bed. If we meet in the morning an acquaintance with a black eye, we scarcely believe, although we do not feel called upon to question his explanatory statement, that he has been leaning rather too hard against a lamp-post. Two attendants at the Asylum were charged on the information of two other patients with knocking down and kicking the deceased, and "jobbing" him with the knees when down. It is possible that the Lancashire jury who tried the two attendants on this charge may have understood, without explanation, what was meant by "jobbing." We should understand, or think that we understood, this phrase if we met with it in a description of a prize-fight, and in that case we should at least feel sure that it described some operation performed upon the body of one combatant by the other's hand. But this "jobbing" was performed with the knees, and it was not performed on a prize-fighter in training, but on a paralytic and feeble man of fifty years of age. The two prisoners were convicted chiefly on the evidence of one patient, and they were entitled to urge to the utmost, as they did by their counsel, the danger of relying in such a case on the testimony of a witness more or less of unsound mind. We accept the verdict which was arrived at after a long and careful trial; but even if it were at all questionable, the fact would remain that the deceased received mortal injuries in a place to which he was removed for safety. It is suggested that bed-frames are hard, and it is asserted by some authorities and denied by others that the bones of paralytic people are brittle and friable in an extraordinary degree, and unless we accept the explanation which is thus afforded, we must conclude that the patient died from injuries inflicted on him either by the attendants or by other patients. Either supposition impugns almost equally the discipline of the Asylum.

The utmost horrors of the old system were perpetrated at York, and to Lancaster belongs the rival honour of showing how much cruelty is possible under the new system. It is as long ago as 1815 that a Committee of the House of Commons inquired into the barbarities which had up to that time been employed, and, as the result of the discussion in that and subsequent years, it was established that the great principle upon which the management of the insane should be conducted is that of kindness to the patient. But this conclusion was not arrived at without controversy, and the "terrific system," as it was called, was defended as salutary, or at least as harmless. We rather suppose that "jobbing" was not invented at that time, but if it had been, we do not doubt that it would have found apologists. There was among the governors of the York Asylum a party of obstructives as well as a party of reformers, and the obstructives were able to carry a resolution affirming that a lunatic, whom we should say had sustained gross injury, "had been treated with all possible care, attention, and humanity," and censuring the persons who had made the case a subject of complaint. We have at any rate got beyond this stage of the subject, and there is not now any difference of opinion among educated and refined people as to the principles of treatment of the insane, although the practical difficulty which arises from the character of the instruments employed in treating them must always occasion anxiety to the philanthropist. It is not easy to obtain a sufficient number of humane and judicious attendants in that rank of life from which they must necessarily be chosen. Those only who have lived in an asylum can conceive the temptations to neglect, oppression, and cruelty which present themselves to those who have the care of insane persons, or the difficulty of suppressing that natural feeling of resentment which rises in the mind on witnessing the mixture of mischievous folly and good sense which often marks the character of the insane. "The business of an attendant requires him to counteract some of the strongest principles

of our common nature." This was true in 1815, and it is true now. Even if much might be done by regularly training persons to this work, and teaching them to regard their own credit as involved in the success of a system of gentleness and non-restraint, yet so long as the number and size of lunatic asylums continues to increase, there will be a demand for attendants exceeding the possibility of satisfactory supply. In one respect the pauper patient in an asylum is worse off than if he had been left in a workhouse or under the care of a person of his own class. He may meet with rough, or even cruel usage, but it will not be the systematic cruelty of the hardened attendant in an asylum who finds "jobbing" a convenient resource. It must be remembered that this case at Lancaster is not the only case in which this kind of cruelty has been either proved or strongly suspected to be practised in large asylums. If violence of any kind is resorted to by attendants, they will be likely to choose that which may be employed to a considerable extent without detection. If it be true that kneeling on the chest of troublesome patients has become a common practice, it would follow that the new system of cruelty differs from the old chiefly in being more difficult of detection. The medical officers of these asylums are obliged to record, for the information of the Commissioners, every application by their orders of restraint to patients. But they cannot know whether in the wards of a large hospital "jobbing" may not be practised by their subordinates. There is almost no security for the proper treatment of lunatics except in the character of those who have the care of them, and we cannot help feeling that, after all our reforms, much remains to be accomplished in this respect. When the great mass of our population treat horses gently there will be fewer vicious horses than there now are, and it will be less difficult than it now is to obtain trustworthy attendants upon lunatics.

PRESENT PHASE OF THE SCOTCH EDUCATION QUESTION.

SCOTLAND is beginning to bestir herself once more about her education. Since the collapse of her efforts in the last days of last Session she has been more or less in a state of intellectual torpor on this subject. Her nervous energy was so highly strained by the wear and tear which her representatives underwent at that time that she is only just beginning to recover from her exhaustion. The winter has passed on, and spring has come, but despite the praiseworthy efforts of a few agitators who have vainly endeavoured to arouse the Scottish Lion, that noble animal has remained quiescent. But within the last few days he has been giving indications of awakening. The probable success of Mr. Forster's Bill has aroused him, and he is beginning to shake himself, and toss his mane, and generally deport himself in a way which, to those who know his moods, betokens that he means business of some kind or another. He is a quiet, "douce," placable animal for the most part—a long-suffering beast withal. But he has his hours and his moments like the rest of the world, and education is the kind of thing that generally excites and interests him.

What, then, does Scotland aim at this Session on this important question? So far as we can understand Scotch politics in their present unsettled condition, there appears to be less harmony with regard to some of her wishes and requirements this year than there was last. That she is bent on having an Education Bill is quite obvious. But her views with regard to the character of this Bill are less definite than they were. Last year the field was, comparatively speaking, clear. There was no English Bill, and no indication that there would be an English Bill of the comprehensive character of Mr. Forster's. There was no Education League with its thoroughgoing proposals to mould opinion. There was a noisy faction of Scotch Radicals bent on carrying out their pet scheme of a Scotch Secretary of State. That faction still exists, but their noise is abated, and what influence they had is gone. But more than this, considerable changes have taken place in Scotch opinion since last year. Men's minds have been greatly cleared during the recess. The tide of opinion has begun to turn towards a complete separation of religious and secular instruction as being the only means of establishing on a sound basis a national system of education. That this is the direction that the current is going to take is obvious from the tone of the speeches made at public meetings which have been held at Edinburgh and Glasgow. But, however much the more enlightened people in Scotland may desire such a consummation, they do not appear to be unreasonable about it. What they want is an Education Bill, and they will not imperil the success of this Bill by insisting on what, in the present state of ecclesiastical feeling, is hardly attainable. When they cannot get what they love they mean to love what they can get. They see the English Bill well launched and in full sail, and they desire to follow in its wake. They wish Mr. Forster's Bill, as one of the speakers said, "to play tug" to the Scotch Bill, and "so bring it safely through the shallows and intricacies and storms of Imperial legislation." They are shrewd enough to know that, whereas twenty years ago they were a full century ahead of England in elementary education, at the present moment, thanks to the efficiency of the Privy Council system, the two countries are running side by side; and that, if Mr. Forster's Bill should pass, the tortoise will win the race and England will in a couple of years be a long way ahead of Scotland. This would not be gratifying to the country's pride; but it would be inevitable. The more intelligent among Scotchmen see this with

some alarm, and are preparing themselves to avert such a contingency. And the Scottish Lion is beginning to shake off his drowsy slumbers.

But there is a want of definiteness in the aims of those men who have been taking part in the public meetings in Scotland. There seems to be no guiding hand among them. There is often a want of thoroughness in Scotch public work. There are always plenty of speakers willing to speak on any subject. But they speak round about it. Their knowledge is so multifarious that it is apt to be superficial. They get into platitudes, and show no special knowledge of what they are speaking about. The speeches delivered recently on this subject were all vague. The proposals for the most part were timid and tentative, and were not always consistent. Some of the speakers were afraid of Mr. Forster's Bill, and jealous of English interference. Others were full of admiration of it, and eager to be saved through it from the dangers which would surround them if they were severed from England, and entrusted to the care of the leaders of their own Scotch sects. Though individuals among them probably knew what they wanted, they did not express their knowledge. There was no definite proposal made which could guide either the Government or Parliament; and unless a prophet should arise among them, it seems as if they would go on passing resolutions without clearly understanding what they were discussing or realizing what they were resolving.

It may seem a piece of unwarrantable intrusion on our part to presume to guide Scotch opinion on this matter, and we can hardly expect the Northern mind to adopt the advice of a Southern journal. But sometimes outsiders see more of the bearing of things than those who are engaged in them. And, believing that we are somewhat in that position, we venture in all humility to suggest what appear to us here to be a few obvious truths.

And, first, it is clear that the chances of a Scotch Bill this Session depend on the probable success of the English Bill. Mr. Gladstone has said so, and it may be taken as an ascertained fact. This being so, the first thing Scotland has to do, if she wants a Bill, is to assist to the best of her ability in the passing of Mr. Forster's Bill. There are no doubt many things in that Bill which do not commend themselves to all Scotchmen. Many would like to go much further than Mr. Forster proposes. But the principles of his Bill are nearly identical with those of the Scotch Bill of last year. "It so happens," as one of the Glasgow speakers said, with a pardonable confusion in his simile, "that the Scotch Bill of last year was just twin sister to the English Bill of this year, as like as if they had been twins, only that the English one is a boy with a little more go in him." And the Bill of last year would on the whole have been acceptable in Scotland. If, then, the Scotch representatives aid the passing of the English Bill, and its success should appear to be tolerably certain, the second thing to be done is to prepare a Scotch Bill as like to Mr. Forster's as the circumstances of the two countries will permit.

In preparing such a Bill it is essential that a clear distinction should be made between the principles and the details of the measure. What is wanted is a Bill which shall provide for the establishment of schools wherever they may be required, the efficiency of these schools when they are established, and funds to pay for them. Organization, inspection, and money are the three things necessary. These are the essential principles on which the Scotch Bill must be founded, and everything else is matter of detail.

With regard to the first, there must be some central authority to organize; and there may be, as there was last year, some difficulty about this. Last year it was necessary that the central authority should be in Scotland, because there was no machinery to provide for it in England. This year it is different. On the assumption that Mr. Forster's Bill passes, there will be a State department formed for Education, and that department will be occupied in doing for England precisely what the Scotch central authority would have to do for Scotland. This being so, the question of Scotch control comes to be a matter of detail. It does not matter in the smallest degree whether the central authority be in London or in Edinburgh. So long as the work is entrusted to honest men who know what they have to do, and who will do it impartially, looking only at the good of the country, and not at the good of this or of that political party or ecclesiastical sect, it is a matter absolutely of no moment from what quarter the work is done. If there is to be an English and an Irish department in London, it seems absurd that there should be a Scotch department in Edinburgh. And it would seem almost profligate in an economical Government to establish a couple of agencies in different parts of the island to do the work of one. The question, therefore, of the locality in which the central authority is to be situated seems to us to be essentially a matter of detail. If Government should decide upon establishing a Scotch Board we should wish it well. But, learning a lesson from the experience of the closing hours of last Session, we should watch with curiosity and interest the nature of its constitution. Considering, however, that last year's Bill was sacrificed mainly owing to the disputatious wrangling which arose about this Board, we should imagine it to be the more prudent course for the Government to concentrate the authority in a branch of the Education Department composed of Scotchmen who know their country and its wants.

The second principle is inspection. As to this there can be no difficulty. Mr. Forster's Bill provides for the surrender of denominational and the establishment of universal national inspection.

No one in Scotland would be likely to dispute the prudence or desirableness of a similar provision in the Scotch Bill.

The third principle is the necessity of funds. The provisions made on this head in last year's Bill were in the main satisfactory. Funds were to be provided from three sources—fees, local rates, and Imperial grants. The local rate was limited to a sum of threepence in the pound, and this limitation gave rise to considerable controversy. The promoters of the Bill were satisfied that threepence was sufficient. Its opponents were satisfied that the measure would break down on this point. The latter certainly made out a strong case against the rate, and the promoters never grappled with this difficulty or explained it away in a manner that was either satisfactory or convincing. But why limit the rate? Why should it not be left to the decision of the local Boards? If these bodies can be trusted to solve the religious difficulty for themselves, they certainly can be trusted to solve the pecuniary one. The grants from Imperial sources provided by last year's Bill were thoroughly satisfactory. They were liberal without being profuse. And, had the Bill passed, the money which would have flowed into Scotland from this source would have been well expended. It is most desirable that last year's provisions in this respect should be preserved.

These three principles being established, there is no necessity to do more this Session. By means of them a measure will be incorporated in the Statute-book which will provide good schools over the whole country, and will bring education to the door of every family in Scotland. If, in addition to them, the Government should see their way to propose provisions for compulsory attendance which can be practically carried out, they need anticipate no objection on this score. The townsmen seem all desirous of seeing compulsory clauses introduced, and the country folk are not likely to oppose such a proposal. The only point of difficulty which remains is raised by the schoolmasters who demand a special code for Scotland to supersede the Revised Code. This is important in its way, but its importance is altogether secondary when compared with the superlative necessity of establishing efficient schools throughout the country. An informal Commission consisting of half a dozen intelligent men—three of them connected with the Education Department, and three representatives of Scotch education chosen from among the schoolmasters, or from the governing bodies of the Scotch Universities—could settle the question of a Scotch code at a single sitting.

The advice, then, we would give to Scotland is this:—Give your support in the first instance to Mr. Forster's Bill, and carry it through with such modifications as the Government will accept. Bring in a Bill for Scotland as nearly identical as may be with the English Bill, and such a Bill might pass through both Houses, in the wake of the other, almost without discussion. Secure a measure which will provide good schools, universal unsectarian inspection, liberal grants from the Imperial funds, and compulsory clauses if possible. And to do this take care of the principles, and let the details take care of themselves. And finally, lay aside for a season your personal feelings and crotchets, your political predilections and party tactics, and, if you can only do so, your ecclesiastical animosities. Bear in mind that this is no Church, nor party, nor personal matter. It is a matter which concerns the wellbeing of a mass of your fellow-countrymen who are growing up in ignorance and crime, and whose present state is a disgrace to civilization.

THE PRIENE MARBLES.

THANKS to the liberality of the Society of Dilettanti and the energy of the Keeper of the Classical Antiquities in the British Museum, our National Collection has obtained a very valuable addition to its great mass of treasures. We allude to the marbles which have recently arrived from Priene, and which, in accordance with a vote of the learned Society to which they were consigned, have within the last week become the property of the nation. These marbles would at any time have been highly prized, but they are now of special importance to the department of the British Museum in which they will soon be exhibited, inasmuch as there is no slight affinity between them and those Halicarnassean marbles which have recently found their place there. It is intended, we believe, as soon as the scattered fragments have been to some extent put together, to exhibit several specimens of the sculptures from Priene in the room which has lately been allotted to the remains of the Mausoleum. Among those specimens will probably figure a capital, and portions of a cornice ornamented with projecting lions' heads, which bear a strong resemblance to corresponding parts of the Mausoleum, and the same room will then offer two good illustrations of Ionic architecture to both of which dates can be assigned with certainty. Before proceeding to say anything more about these marbles it may be as well to make a few remarks about the spot from which they come, and the Society to which their arrival is due. It may be that every schoolboy ought to know where Priene stands, and who are the Dilettanti by whose direction it has recently been explored, but even at the risk of carrying our owls to Athens we will venture to offer some slight information on both subjects. To begin with the Society—in the year 1734 "some gentlemen who had travelled in Italy, desirous of encouraging at home a taste for those objects which had contributed so much to their entertainment abroad, formed themselves into a Society, under the name of the Dilettanti." The

preface to one of the Society's publications from which we quote goes on to say that "it would be disingenuous to insinuate that a serious plan for the promotion of Arts was the only motive for forming this Society," friendly and social intercourse being the first great object in view, but it also affirms that under no circumstances has it ever "abandoned the cause of virtue." In the year 1764 the Dilettanti discovered that they had a considerable balance of money in hand, and they determined to spend it on an exploring expedition to the East. Accordingly, Mr. Chandler, the well-known editor of the *Marmora Oxoniensia*, was sent out with a couple of artistic companions to Greece and Asia Minor, and the results of the journey, which occupied rather more than two years, were made known to the public by means of a bulky work published by the Society. Among the places explored by Mr. Chandler was the ruined city of Priene, to which considerable space is devoted in the Society's volume of *Antiquities of Ionia*. But all that was done at that time was to delineate and describe the ruins. Mr. Chandler left the shattered marbles lying where he found them. That was rather more than a century ago. In the autumn of 1868 the Society determined to send a new expedition to Priene, under the direction of Mr. Pullan—this time not only to explore, but to annex. This was done, and at a later period Mr. Newton, at whose disposal a considerable sum of money had been placed, in aid of this enterprise, by a well-known lover of art, joined the explorers at Priene, in order to make arrangements for the transport of what Mr. Pullan had acquired. But after the marbles which were selected for removal had been made ready for their journey, it was found necessary to wait a considerable time before they could be removed. Between Priene and the nearest station of the Smyrna and Aidin Railway stretches a roadless plain, into the soil of which even ordinary carts are apt to sink during the spring and early summer. As to the waggons in which the ponderous blocks of marble, some of them weighing from two to three tons, were conveyed, it was impossible for them to undertake the journey till the month of August. It required a long series of journeys, each occupying eight days, to transport the thirty tons of marble to the railway station. There they were carefully packed and sent on to a port from which they were conveyed, first to Malta, and then to England. Very soon after their arrival the Society of Dilettanti, whose property they were, generously made them over to the nation.

As regards Priene, much might be said in reference both to the history and the topography of the city. In the days of its splendour its appearance must have been as striking as the views from its terraces were magnificent. Even now, when one of the principal features of the landscape has disappeared, the view which may be enjoyed from the site of its ruined temple is singularly beautiful. Behind stand the cliffs, up which a narrow footpath leads to the Acropolis, and higher still rise the mountain heights of Mycale. In front the ground once occupied by the old city, terrace below terrace, falls away to the plain. There the Mæander silently winds its mazy way through the rich alluvial soil, and beyond it the jagged peaks of Latmos rise above the cave in which of old Endymion slept. But, beautiful as is the view now, it must have been fairer still in the days when Priene was a maritime port, the sea occupying the space in front of the city which is now part of the valley of the Mæander. Of all the rivers of Asia Minor the Mæander was the most remarkable for its production of new land. What it conferred on one spot it naturally took away from another, and so well were its habits in this respect known that it "was indictable for removing the soil when its margin tumbled in; and the person who recovered damages was paid from the income of the ferries." Its behaviour towards one of the neighbouring cities was particularly bad. Myus was originally a seaport, bordering on a bay which abounded in fish. It was on that account that it was given to Themistocles, in order that his table might be furnished with that delicacy. But after a time the deposits of the Mæander produced a dam which cut off the bay from the rest of the sea, and eventually turned it into a freshwater lake. From this such swarms of gnats arose that the inhabitants of Myus were actually driven out of their homes. Packing up their goods and other valuables they abandoned the city to the gnats and migrated in a body to Miletus. The insects remained masters of the position, and "a writer of the second century relates," we are told, "that nothing remained of Myus, in his time, but a Temple of Bacchus of white stone or marble."

So much for the position of Priene. As regards its history we know that it once enjoyed a considerable reputation, chiefly on account of the beauty of its temple, which was dedicated to Athene Polias. Whatever temples it possessed at the time of the expedition of Xerxes were probably destroyed by him, the only temple he spared in Ionia being that of Ephesus. At what subsequent period the Prieneans began to rebuild them seems to be uncertain, but when Alexander came that way it may be presumed that he found the Temple of Athene in progress, for his name occurs as its dedicatory on a stone which used to be at the east end of the heap of ruins, but which is now in the British Museum. The inscription, which runs ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΑΝΘΗΚΕ ΤΟΝ ΝΑΟΝ ΑΘΗΝΑΙΩΙ ΠΟΛΙΑΔΙ, is especially interesting, inasmuch as it is believed to present the sole instance in which Alexander's name occurs epigraphically by his own command. It seems that the inhabitants of Priene were less independent than those of Ephesus, for when Alexander wished his name to figure as the dedicatory of the restored Temple of Diana, after its destruction by Herostratus, and offered in return

to repay to the Ephesians all that they had spent upon it, they refused to entertain his proposal. The marbles brought from Priene contain another very interesting inscription referring to the history of the city. It was copied by Chandler and Lebas, and it has been recently edited by Mr. Waddington in his continuation of Lebas's *Voyage dans le Levant*, but none of the copies hitherto taken have been perfect. Now that we possess the original we shall, in all probability, be able to obtain a correct reading of the whole. It relates to a quarrel between Priene and Samos, dating back as far as the celebrated Bias of Seven-Sages notoriety. As the contending parties could not settle the question themselves, they referred it for arbitration to Lysimachus, as well as to several other princes, and also to the Rhodians, who seem to have given a decision in favour of Priene. But the dispute still dragged on; during the reign either of Ptolemy Evergetes or of his successor, Ptolemy Philopator, it was again decided partially, if not entirely, in favour of Priene; but after the defeat of Antiochus the Great, when the Romans sent the Consul Cn. Manlius, with ten assistant judges, to settle the state of affairs in Asia Minor, the Samians contrived to get a decree in their favour. This, however, which was obtained B.C. 183, was set aside B.C. 136, by a decision of the Roman Senate, which confirmed the original judgment of the Rhodians. Thus, in all probability, ended a lawsuit which had been running, or at least creeping, for upwards of four centuries.

When the first exploration of Priene by the agent of the Dilettanti Society took place, the ruins of the Temple of Athene were found lying in scattered heaps just as they had fallen after the shock of the earthquake which overthrew the edifice. These ruins were recently cleared away by Mr. Pullan to such an extent as to lay bare the entire area of the cella, and he also dug over the ground in front of the temple as far as the Propylea. One of the results of his researches was, that at one end of the cella an immense pedestal with enriched mouldings was found, on which no doubt used to stand the colossal statue of Athene Polias herself. This *adytum*, or shrine, had been anciently fenced off from the rest of the cella by a bronze grating, the traces of which are still apparent on the pavement. On that pavement and on the tops of the ruined walls of the cella were various fragments of sculpture. Among the most striking of those which have been transferred to the British Museum may be mentioned a foot, a hand, and some other portions of a colossal female figure, the execution of which may safely be referred to the best period of Greek sculpture, and which in all probability belonged to the celebrated figure of Athene which stood on the pedestal. On a smaller scale is a female head of great beauty, which in its peculiar headdress, as well as in its general character, is very similar to one of the heads discovered by Mr. Newton on the site of the Mausoleum, and engraved in his *Travels*. There are also two draped torsos, a smaller female head, a male head and several hands, as well as a pair of bronze wings, which may have belonged to a figure of Victory held in the hand of Athene. All these fragments of sculpture are discoloured by fire, and have evidently suffered at some period when the beams of the temple must have fallen on the pavement in a burning state. But there are other fragments which bear no traces of fire, and which evidently belong to a frieze. The figures are in very high relief, and at least some of them will probably be found, when the fragments are put together, to belong to some battle scene, perhaps a *Gigantomachia*. In their modelling and general treatment these figures present a striking resemblance to those on the frieze of the Mausoleum.

We trust that we shall learn more about these sculptures, and about the beautiful Ionic architecture of the temple to which they belonged, when the Dilettanti Society publish their next volume on Ionia, which, it is to be hoped, will contain a full account of Mr. Pullan's recent mission to Teos, the Smintheum, and Priene.

PEEP O'DAY.

THERE is no evil without some compensating good, and if Ireland is a constant trouble to the politician, she is a perennial resource for the dramatist who needs an exciting situation. The interest which Irish affairs excite in England is probably the reason why Irish dramas are produced or revived in the London theatres, and certainly it is remarkable that English audiences have a special liking for the dramatic aspect of Irish treason. In the drama of *Peep o'Day*, which is now being performed at Drury Lane Theatre, the rebels of 1798 are not only victorious in conflict with the King's troops, but they defeat muskets and bayonets with broom-handles, and swords with shillelaghs. A dramatist may do almost as he likes with facts, but he is usually expected to show some regard for the feelings of his audience, and therefore we must assume that those feelings are not outraged by the ignominious surrender of a party of soldiers to the Peep o'Day Boys. Such a spectacle is particularly remarkable when it is presented by Her Majesty's Servants at Drury Lane Theatre, where a detachment of the Foot Guards keeps order, while their predecessors of the last century are exhibited as unable to use the arms they carry. The successful movement of the rebels is undoubtedly a surprise, but a mob of rustics cannot surround a body of troops without giving them an opportunity for at least one discharge of firearms; and if an officer holding a drawn sword is attacked by three or four men with sticks, he ought to make at least an attempt to run one of them through the body before submitting to be disarmed. We should suppose, after

witnessing this play, that the only persons in Ireland who cannot fight are the Royal troops. The play has been performed repeatedly, and with unvarying success, both in England and America; and indeed the manager of Drury Lane Theatre seems to be so confident of its attractions that he almost leaves it to act itself, without troubling himself about the quality of the actors. An audience at New York or Boston would probably have no difficulty in believing that the British Guards could be overthrown by peasants armed with bludgeons, or even by old women carrying mop-sticks, but it might have been expected that the honour of the scarlet uniform would not be utterly disregarded by the inhabitants of London. However, we must admit that this drama contains other elements of popularity besides treason. It is replete with sentiments and incidents that are sure to arouse the gallery. "It isn't fine clothes that can make either an honest man or a gentleman," particularly when the wearer is the son of a rackrenting middleman and tithe-proctor.

The play opens with a scene in front of a "neat rustic cottage." A brother and sister and some neighbours converse without, while there are within an invalid mother and an aged grandfather. The rent of the cottage and farm is due next day, and if it is not paid the rackrenting middleman will be sure to distrain upon the stock. "Heaven forbid," says the girl, "it would kill my mother"; to which a friend of the family answers "It's little he would care for that." The sister is on the stage from the rising of the curtain, but the brother only appears after a short interval. He has been to Dublin to raise money to pay the rent, and, wonderful to say, he has raised it, by the sale of poems of his own composing. The wonder perhaps is not so much that there should be wit upon an Irish farm to write poems, as that there should be money in a shop in Dublin to pay for them. The joy of the family over this deliverance is, however, short. The county in which they dwell is under martial law, which renders any person found abroad after eight o'clock in the evening liable to transportation. The author of the poems is enticed out of the cottage and has some treasonable papers slipped into his pocket by the middleman's son who has the clothes but not the spirit of a gentleman. He is arrested and searched by the patrol, and is tried by a military tribunal and sentenced to transportation. The patrol consists of ten or a dozen soldiers, commanded by a lieutenant, and we wonder that it did not occur to the author to turn out the occupants of the cottage, consisting of the old grandfather, the invalid mother, the daughter, and one friend of the family, and make them put the soldiers to the rout, and rescue, at least temporarily, the prisoner. It might have been mentioned afterwards that he had been again arrested and conveyed to Dublin by a strong force of cavalry, infantry, and artillery. However, we believe that this is the solitary instance in the play in which soldiers are of any use at all, and they could not have been more incapable than they afterwards become of action if Mr. Gladstone had been the Prime Minister and Lord Spencer the Lord Lieutenant of the period. The politeness of the soldiers, as well as their inefficiency, seems to have a Gladstonian relish. "Oblige me with your permit for being out at this hour." We doubt whether officers of the Royal troops spoke thus to suspected rebels in 1798. But if that were the usual style of communication, we must suppose that a court-martial requested the poet to do them the favour to remove with all convenient speed from Ireland to Australia, and to remain there seven years.

This period has elapsed between the first and second acts, and in the absence of the poetical son the family has been ejected by the middleman, the grandfather and the mother have died of sorrow and privation, and the daughter has been forced or enticed into a marriage or mock marriage with the middleman's son. In this afflictive condition of domestic circumstances the poet returns from transportation, and becomes, as might be expected, a leader of Peep o'Day Boys, who maintain a chronic insurrection in his native county. If we add that the girl whom he had loved seven years before has by this time forgotten him, we shall have enumerated all the elements of the character of one of those gloomy melodramatic heroes whose dwelling is in a cave, and who appears amid the shades of evening wrapped in a cloak, and says "Beware." The insurrection of the Peep o'Day Boys is restrained, not by the military force stationed in the county, but by the mediation of a Roman Catholic priest, Father O'Cleary, who seems to have enjoyed in the last century an influence at Dublin Castle similar to that which has been ascribed in recent times to Cardinal Cullen. The reverend pacificator interposes, not so much to preserve the Peep o'Day Boys from the soldiers as to preserve the soldiers from the Peep o'Day Boys. He has much influence, which he exercises in many ways over his flock, and he notably combines the spiritual with the carnal weapon in his warfare against sin, for he first remonstrates with a robber and then knocks him down and takes his plunder from him. As this play is frequently represented in the United States, and as the famous Heenan has now become available for dramatic purposes, we venture to suggest that the part of Father O'Cleary would be well adapted to his peculiar talent. The authority of this valiant priest is shown by his stopping a faction-fight at a fair, which is got up among the native Irish by way of keeping their hands in until they fight the soldiers. The fight is preceded by races, games, and other diversions, including the well-known song of the Shan Van Vocht, which, like all other metrical effusions of Irish treason, is highly popular in England. These proceedings are witnessed by two officers of the Royal troops, who have expressed a desire to see

the fun of the fair, and when the fight begins it is the opinion of everybody present that the occupation of these officers is gone as completely as Othello's. The stage direction for the beginning of the fight is "The women seize Graham and Howard and carry them off; they striving to remain. Faction fight." We are not informed what the women did with the officers whom they carried off, and we can only conjecture that they put them to bed and tucked them in. This scene is the more grotesque from the introduction into it of the names of Graham and Howard, which have been made familiar to us in poetry and romance as types of chivalrous perfection. Let us imagine the Marquis of Montrose or the Earl of Surrey, who won Flodden Field, being cleared away like chairs or tables to make room for a fight. The only passage in dramatic literature that occurs to us as a worthy parallel to this is to be found in a farce of the last century, where an officer of Volunteers, after narrating his arduous service in marching and counter-marching from Ealing to Acton and Acton to Ealing, adds that he and the colonel and the major and the adjutant were stopped and robbed on their return from a field-day by a single footpad. The representative of the Howards is no sooner out of one scrape than he falls into another. The fight which he and the scion of the house of Graham were not allowed even to witness was summarily stopped by the intervention of Father O'Cleary, who was well known to the combatants, as ready on the shortest notice either to excommunicate them or to punch their heads. These officers, we should think, must have felt like Waverley, when he was informed that the Baron of Bradwardine had avenged an affront offered to him before he had recovered from the effect of his last night's carouse. In the theatres of Boston or Chicago it is possibly believed that the modern aristocracy of England is as effete as its representatives in this play, and in the Theatre Royal, Drury Lane, the feebleness or cowardice of a Howard or a Graham is regarded as a harmless conventionality, like the libertinism and profanity of Congreve's or Farquhar's heroes. However, when the fight is over, Captain Howard is permitted to depart, and he appears in the next scene crossing the country with a guide, who intentionally misleads him. Suspecting an ambush, he draws his sword, and when an English officer in Ireland does that, we feel convinced that upon the stage he will not fight, or will get the worst of it if he does. Accordingly, after a short struggle he is overpowered, and his adversary has him by the throat. But the death-grip is relaxed by a shot from a hidden spectator of the struggle, and the captain renders thanks for his deliverance to a mysterious personage in a cloak, who afterwards turns out to be the former poet of the farm, the exiled son and forgotten lover, who is now captain of the Peep o'Day Boys, and the object of the vain pursuit of the troops which Captain Howard, blind leader of the blind, is supposed to be commanding. In order to render more conspicuous the pusillanimity of the soldier, this scene is immediately followed by one which exhibits the combativeness of the priest. The redoubtable Father O'Cleary drops upon one of his parishioners who has just robbed the postman, and, finding moral suasion useless, tucks up his sleeves and inflicts penance on the robber by polishing him off neatly. This is the scene in which we think that Heenan would be effective as the priest; and when he says that "he supposes he has got the knack of hitting hard," an American audience would be certain to "endorse," as they say, the sentiment.

It would not be an unfair description of this piece to say that everybody can fight in it except the soldiers. The minstrel who once inquired

Who, in field or foray slack,
Saw the blanche lion e'er turn back,

would have received an answer that would have surprised him if he had visited Drury Lane Theatre. The white lion of the Howards and the red lion of the King of England have become, for dramatic purposes, thoroughly domesticated animals. The captain of the Peep o'Day Boys saves Howard's life perhaps under the belief that the soldiers who are employed against himself might discover some spark of courage or capacity if they could get rid of their imbecile commander. The climax of the degradation of the Royal uniform is reached when, under the guidance of the middleman's son, who is the villain of the piece, Captain Howard and his soldiers suppose themselves to have surprised the insurgent leader. Being told that he is a prisoner, he merely whistles to his boys, who rush on from different entrances, armed with the most rude and ineffective weapons, and "instantly overpower and disarm the soldiers." One of the leaders of the Peep o'Day Boys "will trouble Captain Howard for his sword," which is immediately surrendered, under the evident apprehension of the owner that he may do harm to somebody if he keeps it. We should not be surprised if an Irish or even an American author had drawn such a picture of British soldiers for the gratification of his countrymen. But it is odd that such a piece should have been invariably popular whenever it has been performed in London. We almost wonder that the author allows Captain Howard to be of any use even in a ball-room; but we have the satisfaction of hearing, as the curtain falls, that a lady has chosen him for her partner in a quadrille.

We have said nothing of the grand scene in the Dark Valley, where a subordinate villain attempts the murder of the girl who claims to be the wife of his employer. She is rescued at the last possible moment by her brother, the captain of the Peep o'Day Boys. This scene must rank high among the effects of the sen-

sational school of writers. It produces a strong impression with hardly any effort of the author or the actors. The faces of the characters cannot be discerned in the darkness of the valley overhung with rocks, and they say nothing worth remembering. This we take to be a fair description of what is meant by "sensational" composition. The revival of *Peep o'Day* cannot be considered as the dawn of hope for the English drama, but it is in one respect seasonable, as Mr. Boucicault, the great master of sensation, has abandoned for a time the well-worn path, and has contented himself with adapting from the French a very amusing piece. It is, as times go, high praise to say that in *A Dark Night's Work* there is a mill-stream and nobody jumps into it, and although the title is suggestive of murder and suicide, the only crimes committed or suspected in it are those which are cognizable in the Divorce Court.

REVIEWS.

CASIMIR MAREMMA.*

THE author of *Friends in Council* has become a novelist late in his literary career, and he still lingers on the boundary line between discussion and fiction; but his earlier writings abounded in well-told anecdotes and graceful apoloques, and his imaginary conversations have, as one series followed another, been more and more completely surrounded by a framework of scenery and circumstance. *Realmah* attained and deserved all the success which could be reasonably expected from the impossible experiment of delineating, not an imaginary, but an unimaginable world. The story, with all its ingenuity, was chiefly valuable as a subject of criticism to the familiar Worth-Ashton group which projected chapter after chapter, as a child throws a ball with the ulterior purpose of running after it and picking it up. A study of human nature as it might display itself under unnatural conditions is as impracticable as an arithmetical problem commencing with the assumption that two and two make five. The chorus of debaters which at regular intervals succeeded the personages of the drama was as welcome as in an ordinary narrative it would have been intrusive and irritating. To those who had watched Mr. Milverton as he twisted his ropes of sand, it was a relief to listen to his explanations of the principle and meaning of his barren toil. The conversations in which the story of *Realmah* formed an episode embodied fruitful results of experience and of thought in a pure and graceful style; and even the prehistoric phantoms of the lake-city talked excellent English. In *Casimir Maremma* the same merits are unaccompanied by similar drawbacks. The story, notwithstanding the innumerable of a purpose, is interesting, and the hero, although, as his name implies, he is a foreigner, moves in modern English society. The lucubrations of the Milvertons and Ellesmeres, instead of being interspersed in the narrative after the fashion of *Realmah*, are more conveniently distributed into a prologue and epilogue, forming a third of the two volumes. In the preliminary conversation the author, admitting the objections to didactic art, prefers the insufficient apology that he would rather do good than achieve literary success. If a street ballad extracts halfpence from passengers, it matters, on the practical or philanthropic theory, comparatively little that the words are silly, and that the voice of the singer is out of tune. Perhaps it would be fairer to say that he is not propounding a theory, but endeavouring to confer a benefit, not on himself, but on part of the population of England, and on the entire country; but it is safe to adhere to the orthodox doctrine, that the primary duty of artists is to conform to the principles of art. The special lessons contained in works of fiction are only inculcated by a kind of fraud. Young ladies in their theological romances make the good people Ritualists or Calvinists, according to their own predilections, while the fools and the villains are conversely Calvinists or Ritualists as it may happen.

If the skilful and experienced author of *Friends in Council* had been equally unsophisticated, he would in a novel of emigration have merely sent the virtuous lovers abroad and kept the wicked conspirators at home; and in *Casimir Maremma* it happens that nearly all the characters ultimately emigrate, the writer not believing in the frequent apparition of villains, although he introduces a secondary rascal in the appropriate character of a Russian police-spy. The story, in spite of the insidious design of the author, proves and tends to prove nothing, for the scheme of emigration is neither explained in detail nor even fictitiously tested by experience. The influence of a public and beneficent purpose on the characters of those who are engaged in a common enterprise is a legitimate subject of fiction, and Mr. Milverton, or Mr. Milverton's prompter, understands human nature too well to allow the emigration project to absorb all other thoughts and feelings. Count Casimir Maremma, the heir of a noble family in one of the ambiguous countries of South-Eastern Europe, visiting his English connexions, determines to found a colony in some part of South America. After disguising himself for a time as an artisan, for the purpose of becoming acquainted with the inhabitants of a low London district, he is treated as a favourite kinsman by Lord Lochawe, a Cabinet Minister, and he becomes attached to Ruth

* *Casimir Maremma*. By the Author of "Friends in Council," &c. 2 vols. London: Bell & Daldy.

Sumner, who lives at Lochawe House. There are two or three slighter love stories agreeably and naturally sketched; but the conclusions of the minor adventures are probably reserved for a continuation of the story in the colony which must by this time have been founded. The author deserves credit for an original and pretty variation of the incident which terminates in a thousand different forms the one eternal tale of Amandus and Amanda. A few days before the departure of the expedition, Casimir and Ruth, who have misunderstood one another throughout the history with more than the ordinary perversity of heroes and heroines, see from a balcony at the back of Lochawe House an unknown pair of lovers evidently on the point of arriving at a complete understanding:

The young man bent down to the girl, and whispered something in her ear, at the same time putting his arm round her waist. She gently removed his arm, but it came round her again as if it had been an inanimate thing which must move by some inevitable impulse in that direction. And the second time she did not attempt to remove it. Then there was a kiss. They walked up and down together once or twice. Then, as they parted, they embraced again, and at once left the avenue. "How happy they must be," said Casimir softly to Ruth; and so saying he put his arm round her waist as the other had done. She merely said, "I suppose we are to play out the play, as those two have just played it. It certainly was a pretty scene." Then she removed his hand, exactly as the girl in the avenue had done with her lover's; Casimir's arm came round Ruth's waist, in just the same manner as his prototype's; and in short the whole scene was re-enacted on the balcony (or rather in the room, for they had retired from the balcony) just as it had been acted in the avenue beneath them. They both burst into laughing. There was something so comical in the whole affair; but Casimir, amidst the laughter, took care to keep Ruth very close to him. "Do you think, dear Ruth," he said, "if he had asked her to go with him to a distant country, and share his fate as a poor colonist, she would have consented?" "I think she would," said Ruth falteringly, "if—." "If what? Ruth, if what?" "If she loved him as much—." "As much, dear Ruth?" "As much as I do you, my own dear Casimir."

Such a winding-up of a love story ought to reconcile a genuine novel-reader to any number of digressions on emigration. The only defect in the scene which even hypercriticism can suggest is that the epithet "dear" twice applied to the young lady is not warm enough for the occasion.

The real or imaginary narrator wilfully diminishes the effect of his own dramatic faculty by his habit of analysing the characters which he has created; but his critical remarks in themselves indicate careful study and fine observation. The most laboured character in the book is that of Maggie Lauder, a young woman who, having been raised from the lowest class, attracts universal esteem and admiration. Mr. Milverton as usual takes her as a text for a discourse on the aptitude of feminine nature to receive the varnish of civilization. It is probably true that women are more like one another than men, and that consequently the diversities arising from rank and education are in their case more easily effaced; but the fortunes of Maggie Lauder are so exceptional that few persons can have had opportunities of testing the accuracy of the delineation. His disquisitions are happily as entertaining and instructive as his story; and in common with all capable observers of character and society he is astute in discerning the innumerable distinctions between men and women. A more commonplace person, Lord Lochawe, a Minister devoted to the official business which has been the employment of his life, is with much probable fidelity to nature represented as simple, generous, and on some occasions sentimental. The image might safely have been left to explain its meaning without a superscription, if it had not been thought necessary to enounce the general proposition that men of business are generally unworlly. It is true that every active external occupation tends to divert the mind from sordid and personal interests. Great scholars, scientific discoverers, and in a smaller degree busy lawyers and statesmen, are habitually occupied with matters which have no special reference to themselves, excepting as far as success or failure may affect their reputation, their wealth, or their power. The love of business details which is attributed to Lord Lochawe is rarely found in conjunction with great practical ability, but it is perfectly compatible with right principle and with kindness of feeling. The Lochawe virtues, however, seem to have run in the blood, for the son of the Minister, Lord Glenant, although he is supposed to have been, down to the commencement of the story, a dissipated trifler, is more benevolent and more disinterested than his father. His function in the novel is to serve as a contrast to the earnest and indefatigable hero, who is perhaps less prepossessing than respectable, and with writers of fiction the easy and careless Mercutio or Charles Surface always becomes a favourite. In real life the systematic pursuit of pleasure is not found equally conducive to moral perfection. A man who lives for amusement must from the nature of the case always be thinking of himself.

Nothing, indeed, can be further from the purpose of the book than to inculcate or excuse frivolity. Although, like many serious and earnest writers, the author has a tenderness for his lighter and livelier characters, his literary life has been spent in protesting against public and private negligence and indifference. Lord Glenant himself has transacted his dissipations, as Medea murdered her children, behind the scenes, and before the commencement of the story. As soon as he, through the agency of Ruth, of Maggie, and of Casimir, has been provided with opportunities of making himself useful, the self-indulgent loungeur flies from one end of Europe to the other on a benevolent and difficult errand, and at the end of the narrative he departs with the rest to the Utopia beyond the sea. The virtuous and resolute hero of the story is, as the author of his imaginary existence once

or twice admits, in some respects narrow and pedantic. It is perhaps necessary that effective force should be confined within definite channels, and in real life ability and great achievements compensate for the moral or intellectual defects with which they are sometimes associated. In fiction the man has to be represented as well as his work, and it is no disparagement to the author to say that he has not, for the fifth or sixth time since the invention of writing, created a man of genius. A solemn young man is seldom popular in society, nor is he especially interesting in fiction; but it may be admitted that a cosmopolitan philanthropist bent on the accomplishment of a great social scheme might be something like Casimir Maremma. Perhaps: he philosophic essayist would be unjust enough to his own gifts as a writer of fiction to be perfectly satisfied if Casimir and the rest performed the functions of painted giants and fat ladies on the outside of a booth by tempting the curious spectator to walk inside and study the question of emigration. The way of getting a thing done is, as Mr. Carlyle wisely said, for Nature to create a man to whom it seems the one thing needful. If Nature neglects her duty, the next best contrivance is for a popular sculptor to produce a fictitious group which is supposed to be inspired by a concentrated conviction and purpose.

The moral of the pleasant and thoughtful fable is not so much that emigration is expedient, as that it ought to be carefully organized and conducted by competent leaders. Mr. Milverton in the subsequent conversation quotes with approval an opinion of Bacon's, that new settlements ought to be governed by a single person or by a few councillors rather than by a popular Assembly; and he insists on the necessity of providing beforehand all the material conditions of wellbeing which may enable the community to establish itself with reasonable prospects of success. He might have illustrated both positions by the success of the Mormons, who far surpass all competitors in their forethought, not only for the immediate comfort of the emigrant, but for his future prosperity and usefulness to society. The ignorant Welsh or English convert, who perhaps has hardly known of the existence of another hemisphere, finds himself conveyed without avoidable hardship from Southampton or Liverpool to the heart of the American continent, where on his arrival he is directed to the branch of industry for which he is best fitted, or to that in which his services are most urgently required. It is possible that a separate religion, if not a repulsive social institution, may have been indispensable to the segregation which alone rendered the Mormon system of emigration and government possible. The Nonconformists in Salt Lake City who assert that polygamy was not a part of the original revelation may probably, if their doctrine prevails, unintentionally destroy the bond which holds the community together, as the Quakers prepared the extinction of their sect when they a few years since permitted the abandonment of the little distinctive absurdities of costume and language by which they were popularly known. Although it is painful to admit that lies can in any case be profitable and successful, Brigham Young owes to his maintenance of a false religion, not directly the prosperity of Utah, but the opportunity of exercising the vigour and sagacity which have conferred so many benefits on his disciples. It would not have been convenient to make Casimir Maremma a fanatic or impostor; and yet, in default of the divine right which was conferred on Joseph Smith and on Young by the prophetic office, or on the founders of the old Greek colonies on the shores of the Mediterranean by the nomination of the Oracle at Delphi, his gifts and accomplishments may too probably fail to secure his permanent authority over his followers. The enterprise of Casimir Maremma is not properly emigration, but rather the establishment of a colony; and although the world is not yet fully peopled there is scarcely room enough left for the experiment, and there is little temptation to try it. Within the memory of middle-aged men nearly the whole continent of Australia and the islands of New Zealand were vacant; and wide spaces of North America, if they were not absolutely unowned, were beyond the reach of any claimant. After the treacherous murder of Joseph Smith by the citizens of Nauvoo, the Mormons, flying, like the Israelites, through the desert, created for themselves a promised land within the nominal limits of the Mexican Republic, but in a spot where there was no immediate risk of interference with their entire freedom. Already the overflow of Anglo-American industry and ambition has reached their isolated refuge, and a Bill is now pending in Congress for the forcible suppression of their peculiar organization. A monogamous and orthodox settlement would not be exposed to a similar process, but only because it would voluntarily amalgamate itself with the political society around it. If Casimir Maremma had established the best and most paternal of monarchies or aristocratic republics within the dominions of the United States, he would have had to make room for the government of school districts, of townships, of counties, of the State, and of the Union, by universal suffrage. In the temperate regions there is no place exempt from rights of sovereignty possessed or claimed by Imperial or colonial Governments which allow no conflict of jurisdiction. In Brazil and in some of the South American Republics it might be possible to find unoccupied districts where a colony of English settlers would soon be strong enough to resist interference; but Mr. Milverton would never allow his imaginary colonists to engage in war, which he abhors more utterly than anarchy itself. The best chance for Casimir would be to betake himself to Paraguay, which ought to be exempt from war, as a burnt prairie is safe from fire, because its invaders and its defenders have between them nearly exter-

minated the native population. There is no finer or more productive country in the world; and perhaps the Brazilians might not for the present be inclined to another war of conquest; but the chief difficulty of a skilfully organized plantation would be found in the colonists themselves. Experience has shown that Englishmen, when they have once left their own country, repudiate every form of government except pure democracy. The spiritual despotism in Utah, which forms the solitary exception to the rule, is itself ostensibly founded on universal suffrage. Casimir Maremma will probably be the first President or Minister of his new colony, but at the end of his term he will be subjected to the popular practice of rotation of office, and in the meantime he will have been incessantly abused by the infant newspapers of the colony. It is more than doubtful whether he will keep his people together under the inevitable difficulties of the first settlement. They will hanker after the fleshpots, not perhaps of the Egypt which they have left behind them, but of Moab and Phœnicia to their right and their left, where settlers of their own blood and language already enjoy the advantages of a regular society. In the United States, in Canada, and in Australia, ready-made institutions supersede the necessity of a new organization. To fastidious tastes the spectacle presented by the outlying English democracies is not wholly fascinating, but there is plenty to eat, labour is generally well paid, and land is to be had for asking; and the artisan and small farmer finds his happiness, or rather his complacency, greatly increased by the absence of superiors. The gentlemen who propose to accompany Casimir Maremma, unless they have money in their pockets, had better stay at home, for in the new world of universal suffrage there is no room for their order; yet to those who have no share in the undertaking it is better that it should proceed, that hereafter they may hear from a sympathizing and indeed parental historian the result of an enterprise which, whatever may be its fortunes, will be eloquently and instructively recorded.

SYSTEMS OF LAND TENURE.*

THIS volume, consisting of a series of essays on various systems of land tenure, is a very useful contribution to the literature of the day, and contains much matter worth serious study now that the Irish Land Bill directs attention to the subject of the holding and cultivation of land. The first essay, by Mr. Longfield, is indeed the best guide to a fair appreciation of the position of the Land question in Ireland that can be found, and we have already noticed it with reference to the Land Bill. The other essays are naturally of various interest and importance. One on Land Tenure in England, by Mr. Wren Hoskyns, is perhaps rather superficial in proportion to the subject; and we were disappointed to find, in the concluding essay by Mr. Fisher on Farm Land and the Land Laws of the United States, little more than a hurried collection of statistics as to acreage under cultivation and so forth, together with a series of common conveyancing forms. Mr. Cliffe Leslie, who at a very short notice supplied the place of M. de Lavergne in writing on the land system of France, cannot be blamed for not having had time to do more than to extract the salient facts from established authorities that tell most in favour of peasant proprietorship. Mr. Campbell, already the chief and best authority on land tenure in India, has summarized his views and experience in a convenient and readable form, and those who wish to study the subject cannot study it under a better or clearer guide. But the three essays that seem to us at once now in matter, treating of subjects not easy to gain information about from other sources, and showing special knowledge and study, are that of M. de Lavaleye on Belgium, that of Mr. Morier on Agrarian Legislation in Prussia, and that of Dr. Faucher on Russian Agrarian Legislation of 1861; and of these three essays we will proceed to give a brief notice.

M. de Lavaleye's essay on the agriculture of Belgium and Holland deserves much consideration in England. For the British islands, the question whether the system of cultivation by peasant proprietors is a better system than that of large farms owned by capitalists and worked by tenant-farmers may be, at least for the present, a merely speculative one. But it certainly is full of interest. M. de Lavaleye is an enthusiast for the system of peasant proprietorship. He thinks small cultivation beats large cultivation hollow. This is contrary to the received opinion in England, and is therefore so much the more worth considering. The great obstacle to English thought in every department of life is that, living in an island, we think everything English the best. But it is important, in the first place, to notice what are the principles with which M. de Lavaleye sets out. He says that we must look to the sum of happiness, and that, if land is cultivated so as to make sixteen people happy, the system must be better than if four people are made happy by it. More men, he says, are made happy as peasant proprietors than there can be made happy as landlords and tenant-farmers. This is only another way of saying that peasant cultivation answers; for, supposing it does answer, then certainly more persons are made happy by it than by the system of large farms. If exactly the same sum was added to the national wealth whether farms were large or small, there can be no doubt that the greater the number of people who share in the production and perception of the wealth the better.

It is quite true, as M. de Lavaleye points out, that the agricultural labourer is not to be pronounced happier than the peasant proprietor because he lives as well and has fewer cares. He has also fewer enjoyments, fewer hopes, and fewer stimulants to make the best of his mind and body. In the next place M. de Lavaleye says, with much justice, that we must look to the total gross produce if we want to judge of the system of small farms as compared with that of large ones. The mistake, he thinks, of those who praise large farms has been to speak as if farmers grew wheat and nothing else. Fewer horses and fewer men need be kept on large farms in proportion than on small; but the small farmer makes his income by cultivating a great variety of crops. He knows his land so well that he makes the best of every inch of it, and then he husband his manure with a persistent zeal which the large farmer cannot rival. The great success of the peasant proprietor of Flanders seems to come from two things. He cultivates a little of everything, and he not only saves every scrap of manure he can, but he buys artificial manure largely. Of course a race of peasant proprietors like that of Flanders is not formed in a day or a year or a century. It is the product of long ages of traditional knowledge and thrift, and M. de Lavaleye expressly forbears to state an opinion as to whether the Irish, even if they got the ownership of the soil, could rival them. All that he says is that in Flanders, where peasant proprietorship is seen at its best, it is open to none of the reproaches so often flung against it. The peasants are not in debt, they do not subdivide the properties. They think of how to get the most out of the soil, not how to please all members of a family. They spend money freely on manure, they surpass in success farmers on leases in the same districts, they take advantage of the last improvements in agricultural machinery (when those improvements are really profitable) by the commune, or one person in the commune, purchasing the scientific implement and letting it out when required. In Belgium and Holland there is a great variety of tenures. There are large proprietors and small proprietors, and tenants on short leases and tenants on leases almost, if not quite, perpetual; and what M. de Lavaleye asserts is that the peasant proprietors put the most into the soil, and get the most out of it. This is a simple proposition, and, if true, is very important; but neither M. de Lavaleye nor any one else who understands the subject considers it conclusive. Would not a nation consisting exclusively of peasant proprietors be a very poor and tame affair? This is a very suggestive inquiry; but for English purposes what is really important is to notice that the common objections to the system of peasant proprietorship can be refuted by the experience of Belgium and Holland, if M. de Lavaleye is right; and in England the danger is lest it should not be understood how far the argument in favour of small proprietors goes, rather than that it should be pushed too far.

The legislation of Prussia with regard to land has gained a celebrity which is probably but slightly founded on a general notion of its nature. It is very hard to understand what has been done, even when we read an account of it from so well-informed and able a writer as Mr. Morier. The subject is too obscure and difficult to be easily discussed with clearness. Mr. Morier at any rate begins at the beginning. He starts with an account of the very earliest ascertainable form of Teutonic land-holding. In the original Teutonic community, landed property was held by the community, but still in the land so held individuals had private and separate as well as joint and common interests. Each adult male had a house of his own in the township, he had a plot of his own in a mark appropriated to such plots, and he had an undivided share in the common mark of the community. Even, however, the separate plot had to be cultivated by him in concert with his neighbours, and only in his dwelling-house was he absolute. In very early times each owner of land was a soldier, called on to defend the community; but subsequently some one holder got a pre-eminence and transmitted this pre-eminence to his posterity, the highest offices of the township being nominally elective, but really hereditary. Then the small freeholder passed into the state of vassalage to the large, and the feudal system was established and grew. Political events contributed to the gradual degradation of the peasants, and at last almost all the tillers of the soil were little better than slaves. Still, the important point in the history of land tenure is, that the unit of Prussian holding is still the corporation of free allodial owners who are allottees in an arable mark, and co-partners in common lands. The main character of the legislation of Prussia in this century has been a return to free ownership, with unequal holdings. Villeinage, both in respect of the personal status of the villeins, and in regard to their tenures, has been done away with, and the feudal incidents of the tenure of land allodially owned have been abolished. Of the three great epochs of Prussian legislation—those of 1807, 1811, and 1850—the first was marked by the abolition of villein status, the second by that of villein and feudal tenures, and the last by the abolition of feudal charges. As Mr. Morier truly observes, there is nothing very wonderful in these changes, which have taken place or are rapidly taking place in every European country. It was the boldness and courage with which the movement was set on foot by Stein and Hardenberg, and the perseverance with which it has been followed up, that have given a special interest to the history of Prussian land legislation. In 1807, before the new legislation was begun, land was held by the nobles, burghers, and peasants, each class being only able to hold the sort of land appertaining to his class. The

* *Systems of Land Tenure in Various Countries. A Series of Essays published under the sanction of the Cobden Club. London: Macmillan & Co. 1870*

peasants had holdings which none but peasants could hold, but these holdings always formed part of a communal holding subject to a manor. The legislation of 1807 did away with this appropriation of land to classes, as it also did away with villeinage. The interesting question whether the State should favour small holdings on social and political grounds, or oppose them on grounds of political economy, was discussed at the time, and it was decided that the landlord should be allowed in certain cases, but always with the sanction of the Government, to extinguish peasant holdings. Even after the legislation of 1807, the lord had still his manorial rights over the peasant lands, and the peasant, though a freeman, had still to render personal service in the form of labour, while on the other hand he had certain vague rights of pasturage or gathering wood over the manorial lands and forests. The legislation of 1811 gave the peasant absolute ownership, while it took away his manorial claims, and commuted his dues of labour for a fixed corn-rent. At the same time measures were taken to make all land of the same kind, so as to have no difference of tenure, and to facilitate the alienation and transfer of portions of the land as much as possible. Lastly, in 1850, the peasants were enabled by the establishment of Rent Banks to buy up the services and dues which, under the legislation of 1811, they had to yield to the lord. Viewed as a whole, it may be said that Prussian legislation as regards land has been a great and successful attempt to make tenures certain, and to make land pass freely and easily from hand to hand, and to establish a large, though not dominant, class of small proprietors. As Mr. Morier in conclusion warns his readers, these objects have been attained by adopting and carrying out a view of the proper functions of the State which is alien to English minds.

When we find Dr. Faucher's essay on the Russian Agrarian Legislation of 1861 begin by saying that the bondage of agricultural labour taken off by that legislation was of comparatively recent origin, it is impossible to avoid a hope that we shall not have to be taken into the abysses of Russian history. But we are soon undeceived. We are told that in order to judge of the probable practical bearing of what was done in 1861 we must go very far back, as "the free village of old has to furnish the key to the future of the free village of to-day." Here once more we have to set out with the local husbandry of a whole village; and colonization, or the assumption of new land, was continually going on by villages giving birth to other villages, sending them off to great distances and planting them by wholes with a strong tie of sentiment between the mother and the daughter village; and each village was as far as possible self-sustaining, just the amount of acreage being tilled that was necessary to furnish the food and clothing of the village. When surplus population threatened to make the village too small, a new village was planted instead of the old one being enlarged. The introduction of something like Church and State, with pilgrimages acting as instruments of circulation, with convents and the domains of princes serving as centres of influence and authority, was the means of binding these villages together by social, political, and commercial ties, cities arising as places where the different villages might interchange their commodities. But it deserves remark that the village traded as a whole with another village as a whole, and those who went to a city and gave or received orders were only agents for the community. The villages paid taxes to the Czar, and these taxes were in process of time granted out to the minor princes in return for their yielding political submission to the Czar. There were also villages peopled by slaves of the Czar, prisoners of war originally, and the Czar by main force reduced many villages from free villages to the condition of villages held by the Czar as his own property. Thus a large number of villages, instead of being free communities paying taxes to the State, became villages paying rent to, and so owned by, the Czar or nobles. The next step was to enact that no person might leave his village without a passport from the owner of the village, which Dr. Faucher considers was probably an imitation of the Poor-law of Elizabeth of England. Gradually the peasantry became serfs, the property of the lord, and passing with the land; and often even without the land, under the fiction that they were household serfs, born in the family of their owner. The Emperor Nicholas attempted to alleviate the condition of the peasantry by permitting them to buy immovable property and to contract with their masters for the position of free farmers, the Government guaranteeing the fulfilment of the contract. But practically no great good came of it, and in 1861 one-half of the peasants were mere slaves, bound to work three days in each week for the lord, a large portion of the remaining half being serfs of the Crown, paying heavy dues, and ruled by petty Crown functionaries. It was at once decided by the Emperor Alexander and his advisers that serfdom should cease, and that the serf should be invested with a permanent interest in the land; but what should this interest be? The nationalist party insisted that the whole landed system of Western Europe was a mistake, that the old Slavonic village community was the true type to set up, and that a larger portion of the common village land ought to be given for temporary cultivation to the peasant, in proportion to the number of children he might have. This idea was adopted, but not exclusively; the peasants having had the option either of forming village communities or of becoming proprietors of small holdings. The proprietor had to hand over to the villagers land in hereditary copyhold against payment of rent, and minute regulations were laid down, so that what was assigned to the peasants should be of such an extent and so situated as to make cultivation by peasant proprietors or

village communities practically feasible; while, in case the rent was not paid, a certain portion of the land had to be reassigned to the proprietor, and a scheme was devised by which rent might be paid for a time in labour, not in money. A price was fixed at which at any time the peasant can buy complete exemption from all dues to the landlord, and the Government will aid in the purchase by issuing bonds gradually paid off by the money dues formerly paid to the landlords being thenceforth paid to the Government. Dr. Faucher ends by saying that, in his opinion, the village communities will not last, and will gradually fade away, as he considers that communistic habits and leanings are not congenial to free men. On the other hand, the famous saying of Count Bismark may be remembered, that what he dreaded for Western Europe was not the military power of Russia, but the example of its communistic holdings.

It may perhaps be said, as the general result of what is to be found in these essays, that some at least of the foremost States of Europe have set themselves three tasks with relation to land—to do away with every vestige of the feudal system, to make land easily transferable, and to create peasant proprietors. It may also be said to be tolerably well established that, under certain circumstances, peasant proprietors are decidedly successful. Lastly, it may perhaps be deduced that, when a Government is powerful and wise, and can pursue its objects steadily through many years, changes of great seeming violence can be effected in the holding of land without introducing anarchy, and without reducing the standard of national prosperity. But these essays, as all such essays must be, are one-sided and fragmentary. They are only what several able men more or less acquainted with their subjects chose or could afford to write in a limited space of time. Such compositions, valuable as they are, may easily mislead. They leave out the portions of each subject which the writer does not care to touch on. We read of the cases where peasant proprietors have succeeded; we hear nothing of the very numerous cases where they have failed. We are told of the benefits, but not of the evils, of violent State interference. It is of course unfair to ask that such a volume should be what it is not meant to be; but still it may be useful to bear in mind that its true use is to afford suggestions, not to prompt conclusions.

FARRAR'S FAMILIES OF SPEECH.*

WE are better pleased with this little book than with anything of Mr. Farrar's that we have yet seen. If it is now and then a little high-flown, we must remember that it is a book of lectures, and that lectures must be a little high-flown, or people will not listen to them at all. If it is crowded with more allusions to physical science than a philologist, as such, is bound to understand, we must remember that the lectures were given before the Royal Institution, and that the Royal Institution is supposed to have all physical science at its fingers' ends. If there is rather more of moralizing, not to say of preaching and prophesying, than we should have looked for in a purely philological work, we must remember that the author is a clergyman and a schoolmaster, that he has written stories about schools and colleges, of whose moral tendency people have different opinions, but which are doubtless intended for the very best purposes by Mr. Farrar. The lectures must have been highly interesting to hear, and they contain a good deal that is worth reading. If they do not contain anything particularly new, we do not set that down as a fault; we are better pleased with Mr. Farrar when he expounds the views of others, which he can do in a clear and effective way, than when he is putting forth speculations of his own. And we ought specially to mention a graceful dedication to Professor Müller which goes before the lectures.

The first Lecture is on the History of the Study of Comparative Philology, which, allowing for a certain amount of tall talk, gives a good and clear account of what has been. To be sure we do not know what may be meant by "the third great æon of human records," or by "such volcanic centres of religious enthusiasm as Mecca, Sinai, and Jerusalem"; but then this is the sort of thing which we do not presume to understand. "Volcanic centres of religious enthusiasm" cannot be many leagues off from "the deposit of Sinism," and the deposit of Sinism is to us as "the sweet word Mesopotamia." And after these flights among æons and volcanoes, to say nothing of "the telescope of history and the microscope of linguistic archaeology," it is a little lowering to hear:—

Our savage progenitors, like our savage contemporaries, wondered at nothing. Their life, if I may be allowed the expression, resolved itself into a boundless anxiety about their dinner—not, I mean, as to its quality, which is perhaps an anxiety of civilization, but as to its quantity, and above all as to the probability of procuring it.

So, again, the "regurgitation of the Aryan wave," the "bizarreness of sounds" in the Mexican language, the "infructuous" labours of Rask and Castrén, are not to our taste; and when Mr. Farrar tells us that he often uses the word "recommence," we would give him short rede good rede to begin again. As for the pieces of declamation in which he pours forth his yearnings for peace all over the world, or pleads passionately for more kindly dealings towards the natives of India, we have nothing to say against the matter of the talk, we only doubt whether philological lectures are quite the place for it.

* *Families of Speech: Four Lectures delivered before the Royal Institution of Great Britain in March 1869.* By the Rev. Frederic W. Farrar, M.A., F.R.S. London: Longmans & Co.

In the first lecture we think that there are three persons to whom scanty justice is done. These are Giraldus, Roger Bacon, and Sir William Jones. Giraldus, with his *s* and his *h*, may be a special crotchet of our own, but surely the great Friar deserved some notice beyond his name being once used by way of a flourish. His works are full of philology; it would be hard to describe the relations of the Romance tongues to Latin and to one another better than is done in the twenty-fifth Chapter of the *Opus Tertium*. As for Sir William Jones, we do not see how 1808 can be called the year of the discovery of Sanscrit, when Jones had, twenty years before, written the memorable passage which Mr. Farrar himself quotes, and of which he truly says that it contains "the germs of Comparative Philology." But the year 1808 was the year when "the thrill came," and, as we do not know what that means, we are perhaps criticizing something that is wholly beyond us.

Mr. Farrar, however, makes up for this by calling attention to a saying of Horne Tooke on which we think that Mr. Rogers did not enlarge. He was, it seems, the first to find out that the inflexions of nouns and verbs were not arbitrary, but that they had been separate words. The discovery of Sanscrit, as Mr. Farrar truly says, demonstrated what Horne Tooke had conjectured.

The other three Lectures are given severally to the Aryan and Semitic languages, and to the general mass of tongues not coming under either of those heads. They are clear and good on the whole, though ever and anon disfigured by Mr. Farrar's rather extravagant ways of putting things, and containing some rash statements here and there. Mr. Farrar seems to be weakest when he gets nearest home. Conceive such a sentence as, "We have adopted from the Anglo-Saxon the word *flax*." We should really like to know more of this mysterious rite of adoption from the Anglo-Saxon, who did it, and when, and how. We are sure that Mr. Farrar, if he had stopped to think, would have seen the absurdity of the phrase; but this is again an instance, and one of the best that we have ever come across, of the effect of a confused nomenclature on those who do not keep themselves ever on their guard against it. We are sure that Mr. Farrar would not talk of modern French "adopting" a word from Old-French, or modern High-Dutch "adopting" a word from Old-High-Dutch; but this unhappy word Anglo-Saxon leads him into a statement about our own tongue which is every whit as absurd. Then again, in classifying the Teutonic tongues generally, after parting off Scandinavian and Gothic, he tells us that "German proper divided itself into low and high German; and low German again into Frisian and Saxon." And again, "It will be observed that the Frisian branch of Saxon"—an expression which sounds odd after just before distinguishing Frisian and Saxon—"is parallel to Anglo-Saxon, and in fact resembles English almost as closely as it resembles German." By German Mr. Farrar probably means High-German, and this whole passage is a specimen of the way in which so many Englishmen are content to look at their own tongue through High-German spectacles, just as they are content to look at large parts of their own history through Scottish spectacles. Anyhow the passage in Italics is remarkable. It would be strange if a thing did not resemble itself more closely than it resembles something else.

It will be taken for granted that Mr. Farrar, on getting on High-Dutch and English, goes off into some of his tallest talk about "the thought of Germany, the majesty of England, and"—let all Dutchmen, High and Low, stop their ears—"the ebullient energy of America." But, or ever Mr. Farrar's pot be made hot with thorns, we wish to ask the meaning of one or two things. He gets together several instances of nations calling themselves by different names from what other people called them, and one is "Alemans, Germani, *Tedeschi*, and *Deutschen*." Some way after we read, "both 'Deutsch' and 'Teut' are derived from *thind*, people." This is a confused way of talking, as if *Deutsch*, *Tütsch*, *Tedesco*, *Teutonius*, and half-a-dozen other forms, ranging as far as *Tyas*, were not simply the same word. Then again, "The derivation of German is much disputed, but probably it is connected with 'guerre,' and means 'warrior.'" There is a sense in which this is probably true, but Mr. Farrar's words might easily suggest the idea that people talked French in the days of Cæsar.

It is amazing too to read:—

The Romaunt and Provençal dialect—the language of the Troubadours—is dead, and the patois which mainly owe their origin to it, and which are known as Rhaeto-roman, Romanisch, Churwälsch, or Engadinisch, are too unimportant to need special notice.

We fear that Mr. Farrar has not travelled much in the lands south of the Loire, or he might have heard men speaking in this "dead" language to one another, and turning round and speaking French to French or English visitors. Perhaps the discovery that Provençal is "too unimportant to need special notice" is a Nemesis for the exaggerated importance attached to that language by M. Raynouard. But does Mr. Farrar really believe that *Romansch* and *Ladin* come from Provençal? If Lord Strangford were still among us, we suspect that this vagary of Mr. Farrar's would become the subject of many a witty saying.

Mr. Farrar's contempt for the Slavonic nations is a little startling, and, we must add, not a little shallow:—

The Slavonic family, or, as some people prefer to call it, the Windic, may be very briefly dismissed. The members of it, when they have defecated their political existence of the Asiatic dregs of despotism and serfdom, are destined to play a very mighty part in the history of humanity. But at present they have barely emerged from a long-continued barbarism; they

have developed no very important or original literature, nor can we even vouchsafe the name of history to the insignificant and blood-stained annals of their imperial autocrats.

This sentence most likely won Mr. Farrar a cheer; fifteen years ago it would have won him a very loud cheer. But it is funny to find that the name of history is not "vouchsafed" to the religious wars of Bohemia and to the deliverance of Vienna by Sobieski, because they are "the insignificant and blood-stained annals of imperial autocrats." When Mr. Farrar talks about "defecating Asiatic dregs," he has again got into the regions whither plain men cannot follow him; but we are curious to know all about the Asiatic despots who, according to Mr. Farrar, must sometime have reigned on the Oder, the Trave, and the Elbe—Dr. Latham would tell us on the Weser also. Life in Montenegro too may have its disadvantages, but we should think that it was at any rate pretty free from Asiatic despotism and serfdom; if we guess rightly at the meaning of the word "defecated," we should have thought that Serbia was no bad example of a land which had effectually "defecated" itself of things Asiatic; and does not Mr. Farrar know how very modern a thing serfdom is in Russia itself? In the midst of all this, it is not wonderful that Mr. Farrar did not stop to distinguish between the two branches of the Slavonic race, answering roughly to the theological division between those who belonged to the Eastern and Western communions.

Mr. Farrar, as a schoolmaster, is a little over-fond of frightening ignorant people with the extraordinary knowledge of schoolboys:—

Even a schoolboy [he tells us] knows that *dens* and *tooth*, *δίκη* and *judge*, *coucher* and *locus*, *larme* and *tear*, *dies* and *jour*, *vingt* and *είκοσι*, *galaxy* and *lettuce*, *cousin* and *sister*, *savage* and *ἄλγος*, *wig* and *perruque*, absolutely unlike each other as they look, spring immediately and directly from common roots.

Mr. Farrar's own pupils, we have no doubt, know all about it; but we confess that we greatly doubt the fact as to schoolboys in general. But Mr. Farrar's schoolboy can do something yet more extraordinary:—

Cicero was totally unable to understand the Salian hymns, and no ordinary Englishman could, without a vocabulary, explain the meaning of Layamon's Brut; but place side by side a page of Herodotus, a page of Plutarch, a page of Anna Comæna, and a page of Trikiup, and any clever schoolboy would be able to construe any one of them with equal facility, and could thus contrast the style and language of a Greek historian who lived 450 years before Christ with the style and language of Greek historians who flourished, respectively, 70, 110, and 1860 years after Christ.

It is perfectly certain that no schoolboy, however clever, could do anything of the kind without special preparation. Anna and even Plutarch would puzzle him a good deal, and if one set him at Trikiupēs, how would he translate *τὴν γελόϊαν ταύτην σκίρην*? or would he get so far? Would he not rather stumble over the first *vā* or be blown up by the first *revpika* that he came across? And Mr. Farrar again forgets that Trikiupēs and Anna, and Plutarch too, all write an artificial language. If Mr. Farrar and his schoolboy tried their luck with a natural kletic song, they would find it further removed from classical Greek than modern English—of course we do not mean the tongue of æons and defecations and ebullients and bizarreries and regurgitations—is from Layamon's Brut.

We must hasten over the two last Lectures. When Mr. Farrar talks in p. 111 of "that singularly mixed form of human speech, the Turkish," he is of course thinking of the Ottomans only. But, on reading such a sentence, we cannot help again thinking what an "occasional note" it might have drawn forth from Lord Strangford. Here too is an odd saying:—

In Aryan the determinant precedes the thing determined; we say, for instance, river-horse, not horse-river, sea-captain, not captain-sea; in Semitic, on the other hand, such compounds as these are chiefly proper names, and in them, by the very reverse process, the thing determined precedes the determinant. . . . Beth-Shelesh becomes in its Greek form *Heliopolis*, or "Sun-city"; we say Newtown, or Neapolis, they, as in the name Carthage, said Town-new; we say Friedrich, they say *Ab-Salom*; -son is with us a suffix; Ben- is with them a prefix.

Now this is perfectly true of Teutonic, save that we do not say *Friedrich* but (if not Frederick) *Frithric*, but how about the Welsh, Gal- and Bret- alike? Mr. Farrar perhaps never went so far as to think about Leicester and Caerlleon, Winchester and Caerwent, but did he never meet any one whose name began with Mac or Ap or Fitz? Did he never hear of such men or such places as Montacute or Montgomery? Mr. Lysons might perhaps step in and argue that the men of Caerwent and Caerlleon are Jews, and so naturally used the Semitic order of words, but if those lands were tents of Shem, William Fitz-Osborn and Roger "Northmannus Northmannorum" were surely children of Japheth.

Talking of Jews, we want to know in what sense Saint Augustine was a Carthaginian, as Mr. Farrar tells us in p. 137. Many people, we believe, fancy that he was a negro. And one disadvantage both of Jews and Carthaginians had not occurred to us; "In a Semitic language a Thucydides or a Froude were [was?] as little possible as an Aristotle or Kant." Really Mr. Froude's friends should be wiser than to thrust the *ἀγώνισμα* *ἐς τὸ παραχρῆμα* into such direct comparison with the *κῆρυμα ἐς αἶν*.

Yet, with all this, Mr. Farrar's book is, as might be expected, very different from the trumpery little books on language with which we are endlessly troubled. His general method, his general arrangement, is sound and good, and he puts things in a generally clear and taking way. If he will look over his book, correct his

mistakes, and strike out a little of his mere talk, the volume might be useful in bringing some to the study of Philology who might be afraid of grappling with a bigger book all at once.

LIFE AND REMAINS OF DR. ROBERT LEE.*

THE Reverend Robert Herbert Story, having very much to his own satisfaction completed his labours as a biographer, proceeds in his concluding pages to wrap himself up in the "rough garment" and to assume the function of the prophet, after the fashion which prevails, or used to prevail, among undergraduate writers of prize-poems when they have found themselves nearing the limit of their tether or their wit. It would scarcely be fair to a respectable minister of the Kirk to attempt to track the Reverend Robert Herbert Story—our readers must pardon the "damnable iteration" as a trick which we have unconsciously picked up from our present author—to the particular cave of heathenness whence he derived his inspiration, and still less so to deny to his prediction the semblance of truth which it bears:—

Neither to him [Dr. Lee, we are told], where he reposes in the bosom of the great Mother, nor to those whose hearts keep his memory green, can the verdict of envious opponents be of any account. Year by year, as time advances, his figure will emerge more distinctly from the petty adjuncts which once surrounded it.

"The great Mother" is quite beyond us, and we can only leave her and the Hades over which she presides to the investigations of the comparative mythologists; but "the petty adjuncts" are within the range of our hermeneutics, and plainly represent Dr. Lee's clerical brethren of the Kirk, of whom the Corypheus is his biographer, Mr. Story. A more irritating "adjunct," all the more vexatious from the very "pettiness" of it, we should not find it easy at this moment to imagine; nor are we able accurately to measure out the proportion of the sympathy accorded to a good man fighting against adversity which Dr. Lee claims at our hands in regard respectively to his enemies and to the friends who suffered the record of his life to be written by Mr. Robert Herbert Story. In religious biographies we are tolerably well used to twaddle, and to the stock condiments of theological Billingsgate which stand to it in the relation of strong peppers to the fried fish of Whitechapel. But as regards the combination of an execrable temper with an ill-conditioned and slovenly style we doubt the possibility of our going further than Mr. Story's volumes and faring worse. One single illustration only we will inflict on our readers, suppressing of course the name of the object of the writer's attack:—

For more than two years the Presbytery had not enjoyed the presence and counsel of the Rev. Dr. —. He had been sick. Upon some men, especially men of simple and pious heart, bodily affliction works valuable and improving changes. It frequently sweetens a sharp and acrid temper, subdues an impatient spirit, and sweetens the whole character with a milder gentleness and charity. Men recovering after painful sickness their former powers of thought and work, often are moved to use these with a humbler and kinder regard to the feelings of others, and a keener sense of their own unworthiness. That this happy result of corporeal suffering is not the universal rule even among pious persons was proved in the case of the Rev. Dr. —. After his two years' absence and his illness, he came back to the Presbytery in a spirit . . . more stringently intolerant and pharisaic than became a divine of advanced age and of much repute for many Christian graces.

Not from the subject of his memoir did Mr. Story learn this method of dealing with an opponent. It is as peculiarly his own as is another method, in this case perfectly innocuous, of which he has been good enough to furnish a plentiful crop of illustrations in the distribution of accents over his Greek. Mr. Story is very fond of Greek. He must have got at least as high as the Remove before he left school; but he is cautious, and seldom ventures into deeper waters than three words together. A single specimen will serve to show his accentuation of an Apostolic precept, as in remarkable consistency with the practical application of it already quoted:—

ἀληθεύων ἐν ἀγαπῇ [sic].

Dr. Lee himself seems to have been aware of his brother minister's weakness for the classics, and to have humoured him now and then with a scrap of epistolary Latin carefully written down to his comprehension; never dreaming that his good nature would be posthumously rewarded by the appearance in his biography of sentences such as the following, which Mr. Story brings forth out of his treasure-house, evidently in the belief that they are of the purest Ciceronian ring:—

He was tired, and would have rested, if his brethren would have suffered him. "Inspiratio felix, amice!" he writes to me in reply to an offer to relieve him of a Sunday's work, "auxilio valde indigebam illo die. Prædicandi me tædet, et (procul dubio) auditores et cæteros."

It is to be hoped, however, that Mr. Story's literary efforts do not reach "the bosom of the great Mother." Their destination would seem to lie in the direction of another elemental deity.

But the life of Dr. Lee is too remarkable and too full of interest for even a biographer like Mr. Story to spoil. There is an advantage, too, in the simple process of hauling in printed reports and other material by the cartload, and shooting them down after the fashion of a road-contractor. It adds indeed considerably to the labour of a reviewer; but at any rate the materials have

escaped the analysis or epitomizing of the biographer, and we are enabled to gain some kind of insight into the actual life and work of the man. A liberal, large-hearted, and independent spirit, tenacious of its own aims and conclusions, and with a somewhat contemptuous intolerance of the stolid conservatism which interprets "stare super antiquas vias" as a direction to "stick to the parish roads," and rejoices in the deep time-honoured cart-ruts which serve at least to show the way in a mist, must of necessity have felt itself strangely fettered and confined by the position of a parish clergyman in the Established Church of Scotland during the past thirty years. It is difficult for any one trained in the freer atmosphere of English ecclesiastical discipline and thought to realize the pressure of that Presbyterian system north of the Tweed which inherits the prestige of long tradition, and of which the tribunals are as mazy in their complication as their phraseology is unintelligible to a Southerner. From Kirk-Session we are driven to Presbytery; from Presbytery to General Assembly; with the same names and the same speeches meeting us at every turn, and with no recognised authority to declare or determine the legal position or aspect of any person or thing whatsoever; with acts and deliverances and discharges and injunctions and censures filling the air, and everybody seeming to go about among them all without let or hindrance, save from the noise, like the Duke of Wellington among the cannon-balls in the picture-books of our boyhood; and with a new Deborah and Barak coming down to the help of the Lord against the mighty in the nineteenth-century shape of "Anne Sutherland and Cromartie," "Sutherland," and five hundred noblemen, "ruling elders," "rear-admirals," and Scottish gentlemen of the rank and file at their feet, all banded together:—

First, for inviolably maintaining the Westminster Confession of Faith as the doctrinal standard of the Church.

Second, for securing adherence to the simple forms of the Church, and for preventing any change from being made in the same without competent authority.

Amidst scenes such as these, and in a circular series of endless and aimless squabbles, the innovating minister of the old Greyfriars church in Edinburgh followed his own straightforward course to its sudden, startling, and almost tragic close. The Westminster Confession of Faith is not, we believe—we speak under correction from the General Assembly of the Scottish Kirk—quite so ancient or so widely known a formula as the Nicene Creed; and the great Arian controversy (we speak still under the same correction) did not precisely turn on the question whether the "homo-ousion" should be read from a book or said without one; but small questions may in their way reproduce the events of great ones, and a man may as effectually be stung to death as be cut down in the thick of battle:—

The chief interest of the Assembly of 1867 was expected to centre in the Greyfriars case. On the 22nd of May, the day before its meeting, Dr. Lee rode out to Colinton, and on his way home had got to the west end of Princes Street when he was seen to reel in his saddle, and then to fall to the ground.

He had been struck with paralysis, from the effects of which he never fully recovered, and a second stroke at Torquay proved immediately fatal in the spring of the following year. In this interval of hardly-earned peace and quietness on the English sea-coast it was "refreshing," Dr. Lee writes to a friend, "to hear the echoes of that august Presbytery, 500 miles distant. In the midst of them one was not quite aware of being in *concilio Divom*. I fear I may not again listen to their wisdom, having perhaps sinned away my day of grace in failing to improve my opportunities, which I have enjoyed the last twenty-four years. Seriously, I am leading a very agreeable and useless life, and doing little more than think of absent friends and foes; though I cannot say that the latter get much attention, for I have, at present, no hatred to spare."

The Greyfriars case "remains still unfinished, ending only in a postponement." Posterity will learn from Mr. Story's pages that "the whole" of this absorbing "question hinged upon the use of the Book," and from contemporary pages posterity will also learn that "the Book" with a big B usually at the time meant the Bible. From which premisses the very mistaken inference will probably be drawn that the "Greyfriars case" raised the issue of the reading of the Holy Scriptures in some form or other, which would be a very reasonable question to attract the chief interest of the General Assembly of any Church. In fact, however, "the Book" is only one of Mr. Story's habitual absurdities, and represents a volume with a very small *b* indeed, about which it will perhaps appear to posterity incredible that any question should have arisen at all beyond the narrowest local limits. It had occurred to Dr. Lee, many years before, that to be a Presbyterian minister was not necessarily the same thing as to speak with the tongues of men and of angels, or to understand all mysteries and all knowledge. The service of the Kirk might occasionally sound to profane ears as a trifle dull, and appear to profane eyes a trifle slovenly. To an unchastened memory the extemporaneous prayer of the minister might seem as though it had been listened to *totidem verbis* fifty times before, and a pamphlet writer could even venture to describe it as "a long, often doctrinal and historical prayer, uttered by the minister, the people standing listlessly the while, most of them staring at the minister or at their neighbours." Dr. Lee determined, therefore, to take some pains with the services for which he was himself responsible. He would prepare his prayers, and provide for variety in them; and with this end in view he would write them down. Gradually the manuscript Greyfriars Use developed, for convenience, into a printed book;

* *Life and Remains of Robert Lee, D.D., Minister of the Church of Old Greyfriars, Edinburgh.* By Robert Herbert Story, Minister of Roseath. 2 vols. London: Huxst & Blackett. 1870.

and for still enlarged convenience copies of the volume found their way into the hands of the congregation. Nothing could well be simpler, or more distinctly free from the mark of the prelatical beast. The Greyfriars prayers were home-made, and were confessedly "free from the intermixture of obtrusive dogmatism and from the archaic forms of Catholic tradition." But they were something outside the old deep-worn, if not somewhat muddy, cart-ruts of the Kirk. They were probably a good deal more devotional, and possibly a good deal more intelligible, than the hackneyed repetitions with which the average minister is represented as having satisfied his conscience and edified his flock. Their construction was most likely grammatical, and their form was capable of analysis on the ordinary principles of composition. Anyhow they and their author must be put down; Kirk Sessions must be stirred and Presbyteries invoked and General Assemblies appealed to, and heaven and earth and all things therein, including the Duke of Sutherland (presumably in his capacity of an amateur fireman), must be moved to extinguish the ecclesiastical conflagration which threatened to consume Christendom, kindled as it had been by the Edinburgh minister who read his prayers from printer's ink instead of writing fluid. A manuscript, it was allowed, would be harmless; it was in the type that mischief lurked. We must do Dr. Lee the justice to admit that his claims to be regarded as a liturgist were of the most shadowy kind. "As to a liturgy," he says in a speech before the Presbytery of Edinburgh in 1865, "really one might expect in an argument some definition of what a liturgy is. According to my understanding a liturgy is a public document sanctioned by the public and imposed upon all the ministers of the Church. That is what I understand by a liturgy—I should like to know what the gentlemen who have spoken to-day understand by a liturgy. They seem to mean that the reading of prayers is a liturgy. Such confusion of ideas, Sir, is astonishing in a Church Court." "According" to Dr. Lee's "understanding" the Act of Uniformity must of necessity be a liturgy, though we believe it is not usually included in any liturgical group. But we have some suspicion that, if the Archbishop of Syria and Tenos were not restrained by his uniform courtesy from saying as much, he might echo in England Dr. Lee's desire "to know what the gentlemen who had spoken"—about revision and the like—"understand by a liturgy." It would seem, if not exactly wide enough, with Dr. Lee, to include the Oath of Supremacy, to be in a good many mouths a term of very different meaning from that in which it is associated with the great names of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil.

But the more the Greyfriars Use was preached at and "delivered" about and appealed against, the more the energetic Scotch doctor would not knock under. If the Presbytery did not like his prayers, he invited his own congregation to kneel when they said them; and they knelt accordingly, instead of standing as of old. The Kirk groaned. Then the Greyfriars people took to standing when they sang hymns, instead of sitting down. The Kirk groaned louder than before. Greyfriars built an organ. The Kirk gasped in silent dismay. In a kind of hazy terror it saw, or thought it saw, "an altar, or something like an altar," with Dr. Lee standing at one end of it, and a "curate," or something like a curate, at the other; and it heard, or thought it heard, an utterance from the daring innovator more terrible than the voice of any organ-pipe; for he seemed to deny, or at least to question, the literal inspiration of the Westminster Confession of Faith and the absolute infallibility of its framers, and even had been supposed to express unaccustomed and heretical opinions on the subject of Effectual Calling.

Dr. Lee has passed out of reach even of the "echo of that august Presbytery"; driven to his death by a petty, narrow, and most ludicrous system of worrying, which it would be an abuse of words to call persecution, and from which it would be unfair to reason upon the tone and temper of the whole Established Church of Scotland. The clique by which he was again and again attacked and censured were but as a handful in the nation, strong in the vantage ground which long-established custom is sure to afford against change of any kind. But throughout the controversy Dr. Lee was steadily supported by a liberal and compact minority in the Presbytery and General Assembly, while his own Kirk-Session stood by him with enthusiasm; and the publication of these volumes will, we doubt not, secure for the minister of Greyfriars the almost unanimously favourable verdict of English Nonconformists, as well as that of English Churchmen.

THE CASTLES OF HEREFORDSHIRE AND THEIR LORDS.*

THE chief contributors of late years to the illustration of Herefordshire history have been strangers or sojourners not born in the land. Thus Leominster owes the elucidation of its annals to a vicar whose incumbency was little more than co-extensive with his historical effort. Wright's History of Ludlow, which throws much light on the Marches of Wales, and so indirectly on Herefordshire, is in no sense the work of a native; and Murray's Handbook of the county is understood to be the production of a writer from across the southern frontier. In the case of the book before us the author is a comparatively recent comer, and one whose literary and antiquarian tastes would have prompted him

to undertake the same service for any other county in which he might have been benefited. It seems, therefore, as if a feeling of local patriotism was not strong enough in indigenous Herefordians to stimulate them to a task which, as time slips away, must become more and more difficult; and we are loth to believe that this inertness is due to the soil or the climate or the local beverage, which is said to be the parent of so many evils, so much as to a stolid sense of possession, characteristic of human pride everywhere, which shuts its eyes to the fact that old memorials crumble and perish, and consoles itself that what is still visible will at all events "last our time." Howsoever this may be, the destroyer's work is as sure as it is rapid. Of one ancient glory, her timber houses, the county has been so shorn within the last fifty years that, if Mr. Robinson would include them among the old Manor-houses of which he half promises a history, he must be quick about it, as will be seen by any one who compares the drawings of old Herefordshire mansions in Dingley's *History from Marble* with those modern structures which now cover the same sites. No clearer evidence of rapid change can be desired, no more cogent proof of the need of an intelligent record of what has been, before the memory of it has utterly passed.

But the hand of time has been heavier on the castles which Mr. Robinson's quarto is designed to commemorate. A better text for "a sermon in stones," or "in the absence of stones where they might be expected," is hard to conceive. A vast number of these are no more than *nominiis umbrae*, their only token a grassy mound and a ditch, and sometimes not even so much. Out of some twenty, of which the sole visible sign, if any, is a tump and moat, there are some the existence of which in past time is avouched by their traditional situation in manors undoubtedly possessed by leading families or personages. Apart from this clue, Ellingham, in Much Marcle, is only removed from the category of "châteaux en Espagne" by its traditional site being the Quarry wood—quarry, as Mr. Robinson suspects, being the *ruin* which to road-makers and local builders meant the same thing. And even with such a clue it is a trial of faith to credit a castle at Whitney, the *locale* of an ancient county family, on the ground of a tradition that when the course of the Wye was diverted in 1730 it submerged masses of masonry which *might have belonged to a castle*; or at Lingen, where, though the manor, like that of Whitney, can be traced back to Turstin the Fleming, and belonged afterwards to a family of note which took its name from it, there is nothing more than a presumption of the existence of a castle or fortress. Eccleswall and Penyard, though nothing of them remains but moat and mound with more or less tradition of masonry, are the attested nurseries of the historic family of Talbot, though their chief *locale* in Herefordshire was the more famous Castle of Goodrich. Other castles, however, on Mr. Robinson's list can scarcely rank as even *nominiis umbrae*; for example, Cublington, in Madley parish, for which there is only the barest hearsay evidence, though it gives a field to our author's ingenuity in the manufacture of a possible lord for a very problematical castle. On as slender a basis—the name of Castle Hill clinging to a perhaps-moated tump—rests the tradition of a castle at Kington, the early history of which town and neighbourhood abundantly proves its insignificance as compared with Huntington, a manor or lordship of which Kington was a parish, and of which the castle was an outpost not unnoted in the history of the Welsh border wars. We find, in Shirley's *Royal Letters of Henry III.* (vol. i. p. 91), Richard de Braose writing to Hubert de Burgh "to let him have royal letters about his knights at Kington," which is perhaps indirect evidence for some sort of military establishment there; but the absence of any notice of a castle beyond that cited by Mr. Robinson in p. 86 convinces us that the Castle Hill could have been the site of no fortress of more consequence than the rough stockades which here and there were raised for defence of the frontier. Kingsland and Comfort Castles, too, strike us as having but slight locality unless *in nubibus*; nor can we persuade ourselves to regard Almeley Castle as much more real and tangible; though the best proof that time, and not Mr. Robinson, is to blame for the scant substance and verity he can give to these mere name-traces, is that with much research and acuteness he has succeeded, in the last-mentioned case, in connecting the Lollard martyr, Sir John Oldecastle, or Lord Cobham—whose birthplace was long held to be Old Castle, near Pandy, and on the Monnow—with an "old castle" somewhere in Almeley parish, where a farm so-called still exists. Sir John's grandsire, we learn, presented to the living. He or his son granted the advowson to Wormesley Priory, and though by his attainder his estates were confiscated, there is evidence in Mr. Robinson's first appendix for supposing that his son recovered at least the Almeley estate, which passed to his heirs, the Milburnes. Chronicles and annals seems to overlook this connexion, which is not to be wondered at if we note the silence of even Foxe's Acts and Monuments as to Lord Cobham's Herefordshire places. We read of his castles in Kent and his manor in Surrey, but beyond the charge that he sent Lollards to preach in the dioceses of London, Rochester, and Hereford, there is no mention of the county whence he sprang, and where he had a large following. When he escaped from the Tower in 1413, it was, say the chronicles, "in Walliam," but though Almeley and Oldecastle on the Monnow are neither of them far from the Welsh border, he would hardly have gone to one of his homes for a hiding-place. We believe that a Herefordshire archaeologist (not Mr. Robinson) has gone some way towards tracing this hiding-place in a part of Herefordshire nearer the confines of Radnorshire and Salop; but it would

* *A History of the Castles of Herefordshire and their Lords.* By the Rev. C. J. Robinson, M.A. London: Longmans & Co.

be premature to discuss what is not yet before the public. In the meanwhile Mr. Robinson throws a light on the Oldcastle pedigree and possessions, and the possible border stockade which he dignifies as Almeley Castle may have given a surname to the first of the Oldcastles.

The instance just quoted is one of many where Mr. Robinson has dealt far more satisfactorily with the lords who held Herefordshire castles than with the castles which held them; and it is because so few—whether natives or strangers—have been gifted with like spirit and research that his material for detailed information as to the latter is so scanty. What has been collected aforesaid he has ably brought to bear upon the vestiges and memorials still visible, and has so clothed old ruins with a human interest for which indigenous Herefordians owe him warm acknowledgment. From the most ancient site of a castle at Sutton—the palace of Offa and the scene of St. Ethelbert's murder—to Bransill, near Eastnor, a castellated mansion which the bones of its founder, a Lord Beauchamp, Treasurer to Henry VI., could not save from conflagration, though they were long potent in laying ghosts, we do not think there is one which he has overlooked. And Bransill we assume to be the latest-built Herefordshire castle, because, though Kinnersley in its oldest existing features is Elizabethan, there was no doubt a mediæval castle there before it. The representation of "John de Kynardsley and his son receiving the sheriff and his officers when they came by the Conqueror's order to survey the land for the Domesday Book" (p. 88), which adorns the old Kinnersley pedigree, pretends no doubt to a far remoter antiquity; but the author of the volume before us is creditably shy of myths, or he might have made more of this, as also of the murdered King of the East Angles' disappearance through a chair-trap at Sutton (see *Duncumb*, ii. 176). Another virtue with which Mr. Robinson may be credited is the general avoidance of those many *postulanda* which in the pedigrees and genealogies of most heraldic authorities have to be swallowed in *limine*, and at every stage. There is just a trace or two of this leaven in the outset of his notice of Brampton Brian Castle (p. 8), where he supposes Barnard Unspice, Lord of Kinlet, to have made Brampton his principal residence, and to have adopted the designation of "De Brampton" in the reign of Henry I. The absence of any mention of Brampton from a list of border castles in the early part of Henry III.'s reign militates seriously against any such assumption. Some fuller data too are needed as to the Bredwardines of Bredwardine, a castle of the "moat and mound" type, as to which all is conjecture up to 1374, when it was "a toft with appurtenances, called the Castel-place." But a great deal about Bredwardine may be taken for granted in return for the happy and really probable conjecture that the alabaster effigy, in the church, of a knight of the fifteenth century with the collar of SS, a purely Lancastrian badge, may represent Sir Roger Vaughan of Bredwardine, the son-in-law of Sir David Gam, and one of the trio of valiant Welshmen who saved Henry V.'s life at Agincourt.

On the whole, the family histories which come in as illustrative of the castles with which they are connected form the bone and muscle of the volume, from which, however, might also be gleaned a tolerable history of the wars of the Welsh Marches, the Barons' wars with which those of the Marches are mixed up, and that civil war betwixt Charles I. and his Parliament which was the death-struggle of many of the finest castles and the ruin of many of the oldest families in Herefordshire.

Foremost among these in early times was Wigmore Castle, the chief seat of the Mortimers from the day when Ralph de Mortimer soon after the Conquest expelled the Saxon Eadric from the then newly-erected fortress. Of this Mortimer, the King's chief lieutenant in Herefordshire, the descendant in the fifth generation was Henry III.'s staunch adherent in the baronial wars; and it was he who, with a Croft of Croft Castle, conveyed Prince Edward to Wigmore after his escape from Hereford. He fell leading a division of the royal forces at the field of Evesham. His grandson was Isabella's favourite, whose great grandson Edmund, third Earl of March, by internarrying with the daughter and sole heir of Lionel Duke of Clarence, opened for his descendants a prospect of the crown of England which was realized in the accession of Edward IV. At this point Wigmore became a royal demesne, continuing so until granted by Queen Elizabeth to the stewards of the Earl of Essex, the survivor of whom sold it to Thomas Harley of Brampton Brian. Dismantled in the civil war by the royalist Colonel Massie, because he could not spare men and arms for its defence, its ruined Norman keep and later entrance gateway deserve to be characterized in warmer words than Silas Taylor's "melancholy dejected prospect of stately ruins." To appreciate them duly one should look, not at them, but out from them. Towards Ludlow and towards Leintwardine the outlook is worthy of the commanding spirits which so long held Wigmore, and with whom the annals of Ludlow, Huntington, and other castles of the Marches are intimately connected. The Mortimers of the contemporary Richard's Castle, a barony still in abeyance, are a separate branch which merged by the marriage of a coheirress in the Talbotts of Eccleswall, but "Mortimer's Castle," in Much Marcle, seems to have got its name from the grandsire of Isabella's paramour; and Clifford, one of the five Herefordshire castles found in Domesday, fell, after the Cliffords, and the husband of the last of them—John Giffard, a devoted adherent of the King against the Barons, and the victor of Llewellyn in his final struggle near Builth—to the share of the Wigmore Mortimers, and so eventually became

Crown property. But this castle can hardly have been to them more than a casual residence, and after the union of Wales with England it soon fell into neglect and disrepair. Our author, by dropping a link apparently, represents Walter de Clifford, Fair Rosamond's brother, as marrying his young heiress, a child of twelve, to his sister's great grandson, her cousin William Longespée; but this at first sight insoluble genealogical puzzle is explained by the fact that Rosamond's brother's son was the father of the heiress. Her brother Walter had five sons, the eldest of whom, Walter the younger, marrying Margaret de Braose, had an only daughter, who married W. Longespée, the third Earl of Salisbury (see Collins's *Peerage*, vol. iv. 195). We have no space to glance even at Mr. Robinson's interesting account of Croft Castle, or of its owners of the same name who, from the time of Henry III. to that of the struggle between Charles I. and his Parliament, played a loyal and conspicuous part in Herefordshire, and indeed in English history. Like the Lingsens, the Pyes, and the Whitneys, their loyalty in the civil war cost them dear, as regards personal and pecuniary losses, and was acknowledged mainly by barren honours. The Crofts were rewarded by a baronetcy after the Restoration, which is still represented by one of the present members for Herefordshire, but the castle and estates have long since passed into other hands. A scarcely less staunch adherent of the House of Stuart, Sir Walter Pye, whose castle of Kilpeck was dismantled in 1645, and whose castle of Pembridge—towards the Monmouthshire border—was taken and retaken and suffered severely during the civil war, was, in recognition of his sacrifice, created Baron Kilpeck by James II.—after his abdication!

The history of Hereford Castle is so interwoven, up to the Restoration, with that of England, that we need say no more about it than that the author has defined the site and the extent of the fortification, and touched in passing on its defence, in the King's interest, by Colonel Barnabas Scudamore—a tale of heroism to which the Parliamentarians might plead a set-off in Lady Brilliana Harley's defence of Brampton Brian. Mr. Robinson quotes an interesting trait of the generosity of this lady's husband or son:—

Parliament authorized him to levy a large part of the amount [of his losses through the destruction of his castle] upon the confiscated estate of Sir Henry Lingen, his quondam assailant. The royalist colonel was either absent or in prison when the order was given; and accordingly Edward Harley, Sir Robert's son, waited upon his wife with an account of the property assigned to him, and inquired whether the particulars had been properly set down and signed by her husband. On receiving her answer, he returned the schedule, waiving all right or title to the estates which it had conferred upon him.

An epoch full of trials for conscience' sake seems to have brought out the noblest impulses of these Herefordshire worthies.

There are other castles of considerable importance—Ewyas Lacy or Longtown, Eardisley, Wilton, Lyonshall, dating back to the Norman if not to an earlier period, and associated with De Lacys, Devereuxs, Baskervilles, and suchlike Herefordshire names—for which we must refer the reader to Mr. Robinson's interesting pages. Goodrich is deserving of notice as the seat in succession of the Marshalls, Earls of Pembroke, the De Valences, the Talbotts, Herberts, and Greys, from its connexion with the last of which names Earl De Grey and Ripon derives his title of Viscount Goderich. This castle, like others, had its death-throe in the civil war. When Sir Henry Lingen could hold it no longer against the Roundheads, Kyrle and Birch, as many as fifty of the loyal gentlemen of the county—Pyes, Bodenham, Lochards, Wigmore, Cornwalls, Vaughans, and Berringtons—were with him in the castle at the time of its capitulation. The Lingsens were a race of heroes. Of Constantia, daughter of Sir John in the reign of Henry III., and wife of Grimbald Paucefort, Mr. Robinson records in p. 94 the legend of her parting with her left hand to ransom her husband from the Moors of Tunis. The *Knight's Ransom*, a novelette by Mrs. Valentine, is based upon this legend; and the effigies of the hero and heroine are found in Cowarne Church. Those who ransack history for its romance will find another legend to their taste, anent the widow of Henry Vaughan of Moccas, in the early part of the seventeenth century. She discarded her weeds when she gave a young deer-stealer, caught in her park—not a scolding—but her hand in marriage. The poacher was a Cornwall of Berrington, and the son of this marriage inherited Moccas, and augmented the property.

A word of praise is due to the illustrations, which are mostly from drawings by Lady Frances Harcourt. All of them that we know—except that of Lyonshall, which hardly does nature justice—are faithful and happy. The printer has made one or two ridiculous blunders, as may be seen in his attempt to improve upon his MS. in a note on p. 105; but these do not seriously detract from the value of a work which may be characterized as a good idea well carried out, and which we trust that Mr. Robinson will regard—to end with a castle-builder's metaphor—as the foundation and nucleus of a completer and more extensive structure.

IRELAND: INDUSTRIAL, POLITICAL, AND SOCIAL.*

THE readers of this book will find in it much information which, if it is not wholly new, and though it may be learned elsewhere, is both interesting and valuable when brought together

* *Ireland: Industrial, Political, and Social.* By John Nicholas Murphy. London: Longmans & Co.

in the same volume. And we think that they will be more disposed to thank the author for the facts which he narrates than to join him in all the conclusions at which he arrives. The book labours under the disadvantage of appearing at a time when the public mind is satiated with Irish statistics, and when pages bristling with figures have ceased either to inspire or to satisfy general curiosity. Still, as there are certain people to whom "facts and figures" are what art and poetry are to others, we doubt not that Mr. Murphy will find a small and select body of readers who will pore over his columns with that curious enthusiasm which is fired by statistics, and is wholly indifferent to the deductions which they seek to establish.

Mr. Murphy's general proposition is that Ireland has great natural resources—a fertile soil, a genial climate, a clever and industrious peasantry; and his deduction is that, with these advantages, she ought to be as prosperous as England. That she is not so is, according to our author, due entirely to the jealous despotism of the English Government, to its discouragement of her manufactures, to its penal laws against her religion, and its land laws against her people. The current of English opinion just now is so strongly in favour of liberal Irish legislation that all but the few readers who care to think for themselves will acquiesce in Mr. Murphy's theory. But those who do think for themselves, and keep their eyes open to the progress of events, will be apt to question whether Mr. Murphy's elaborate depreciation of the existing state of Ireland, and the causes which he assigns for her decay, are justified by facts. Mr. Murphy begins by contrasting the manufacturing industry of Ireland with that of England. While in England the exportation of woollen manufactures has been doubled and trebled, and that of cotton manufactures has been multiplied a hundredfold, that of Irish woollens has died out and that of Irish cottons has never flourished. The story of the selfish cruelty which inspired the English Government to kill the woollen manufactures of Ireland is too true and too telling not to be repeated. But Mr. Murphy forgets to remind his readers that years after this malignant legislation had been repealed the home manufacture of Irish woollens received its death-blow from the turbulence and strikes of Irish workmen themselves. He does not forget, however, that Nature herself has put her veto on the prosecution of certain manufactures which have flourished in England. As he himself admits, "At a very remote period the superincumbent strata of the secondary formation, including the coal measures, were washed away from the greater part of Ireland, leaving the mountain or carboniferous limestone on the surface." Ireland gained by this a fertile soil (not indeed so uniformly fertile as Mr. Murphy contends), but lost the indispensable element of manufacturing greatness. In England the abundance of coal has stimulated the development of the Northern cotton manufactures, while the close proximity of coal and iron has created enormous iron manufactures in the central and Western counties. The deficiency of the coal in Ireland is a sort of practical bull on a grand and comprehensive scale. It just mars the purpose of all nature's other gifts. It is certainly very trying to the temper of a patriotic Irishman to see some of the endowments which have given wealth and importance to England rendered valueless in Ireland by the absence of others which are necessary to their full use. But then, seeing this defect, the patriotic Irishman ought to make full allowance for it when he contrasts the economical condition of his own country and of England. Unjust as in times past English legislation may have been towards Ireland, it is not responsible for the obliteration of the coal measures, any more than it is for the moisture of the climate or the action of the Gulf Stream. However, if nature has dealt hardly with the country in one respect, she has mitigated her harshness by a beneficent compensation. If some of the special manufacturing properties of England have been denied to Ireland, the soil and climate have been so harmoniously attuned to one another that she need not so much regret the divorce between coal and iron. Our author appropriately quotes that invaluable authority on all subjects relating to Irish land, Arthur Young. "The rockiness of the Irish soil," says Young, "is so universal that it predominates in every sort. One cannot use with propriety the terms 'clay,' 'loam,' 'sand,' &c. It must be a *stony* clay, a *stony* loam, a *gravelly* sand, &c. . . . May we not recognise in this the hand of a bounteous Providence which has given perhaps the most stony soil in Europe to the moistest climate of it? If as much rain fell upon the clays of England as falls upon the rocks of her sister island, those lands could not be cultivated. But the rocks here are clothed with verdure, &c. &c." Surely all this confirms the English doctrine with which Mr. Murphy is very angry—namely, that the fertility of Ireland is pre-eminently that of a grazing rather than of a tillage land, and shows that the substitution of live stock for corn crops is prescribed by the inherent qualities of the soil itself. Mr. Murphy in one part of his book dwells on the immense advantages attending the close proximity of the English market to Ireland. "Were the produce of Ireland," he says, "double what it is, it would readily be absorbed by the sister island. As it is, all the sheep, cattle, pigs, butter, fish, poultry, &c. she can spare are rapidly taken by England." Is this nothing? Is it nothing that there is an annually increasing exportation of dairy produce to England, which would readily take twice as much if she could only get it? Mr. Murphy suggests by a timid innuendo the amusing paradox that "the increasing number of mouths to be fed in England, together with the diminution of the number of small farmers and of the fishing population of Ireland, have had a remarkable effect on the food supplies of some of the Irish cities

and towns where certain articles of food, formerly superabundant, are now very difficult to be procured." He surely does not mean to say that the Irish people are worse off now, because they export food regularly to England and bring back clothing in exchange for it, than they were when they consumed the food they raised and had no export trade to England. When were the days in which the Irish peasantry habitually ate fowls, bacon, eggs, and fish? They have not been chronicled as they deserve to have been. If the suspicion that they never existed is correct, it is surely better for Irishmen that they should create live stock for Englishmen to eat, and get other things in exchange, than that they should be partial consumers of a scanty farm produce, export nothing, and bring back nothing in exchange. Talking of exports, Mr. Murphy dilates with pardonable complacency on the growing trade in linens and poplins. Each of these manufactures an indiscriminating patriotism formerly endeavoured to promote by encouraging their exclusive use at home. Irishmen and Irishwomen were exhorted to wear only the garments which had been spun and woven in their own country. At one time balls were given in which patriots of both sexes were obliged to appear in Irish gingham. A trade thus propped up naturally collapsed. The artificial props were withdrawn, and, as we have remarked, Irish poplins and linens by their own merits make their way to every part of the globe. Does Mr. Murphy see no analogy between the two kinds of "protection"—one to native food and the other to native manufactures?

Mr. Murphy would be no true Irishman if he did not claim for his country ampler aid from the Imperial Treasury. To support his claim, he is obliged to qualify the eulogy which he elsewhere pronounces on the Irish climate. In another part, which we have quoted, he dwells on the mutual suitability of the soil and the climate. But when he has to treat a specific want he admits that its excessive humidity is a serious drawback. "The climate of Ireland," he says, "is one of her difficulties, inasmuch as its uncertainty renders the southern and western parts, as a rule, unsuitable for the growth of wheat. . . . This moisture has its advantages and disadvantages. But the latter would be greatly diminished if a well-devised thorough system of arterial drainage were carried out by Government." This is an old suggestion, and one that is seldom made without a very stern rejoinder. English writers, writing from an English point of view, argue that it is not the business of the Government to drain or reclaim private properties. But unfortunately there is little analogy between the treatment of English and of Irish properties. In England a landlord drains a boggy soil or reclaims a waste as a matter of speculation. He calculates the expense and the returns of his investment, and only undertakes it when it seems likely to "pay." If he does not embark in it himself he does not expect the Government to do so for him. In Ireland the case is wholly different. No Irish landlord, as a rule, makes improvements at his own expense. A few great absentee proprietors, English rather than Irish, may follow out on their Irish estates the same kind of improvements which they have executed on their English properties; but the bulk of Irish proprietors—especially the attorneys and speculative tradesmen elevated to the position of proprietors—never dream of such a thing. Then, as to the Irish tenant, it would be insane if he, who for the most part has no certainty of tenure, were to sink his capital in improving land from which he might be ejected the month after his work was done. The last sentence we quoted from Mr. Murphy we left incomplete. After the words "if a well devised system of arterial drainage were carried out by the Government," he adds "and if, simultaneously with this, the occupying tenant was induced, as he can only be by a complete security of tenure, to put his labour and capital freely into the land, as is done in other countries. . . . There can be no doubt that if the Irish farmer enjoyed a secure tenure, defeasible only by non-payment of rent, he would not only thoroughly till his land, he would avail of [sic] Government aid for drainage purposes, borrowing under the Land Improvement Acts, &c. &c." The latter clauses entirely contradict the former. It is hardly the business of the Government to drain lands for proprietors who will not, or for tenants who cannot, bear the expense. But it is the business of the Government to assist by loan occupants, whether owners or tenants, who have sufficient interest in the land to repay the advances made by the Government. If the Irish landlords remain so blind to their own interests or so hampered in their means as to neglect their duty to the soil, the duty of improvement will devolve on the tenants. But this duty can never be discharged until the tenant has that "complete security of tenure" which Mr. Murphy desires, and which Mr. Gladstone's Bill is supposed to confer. If the Bill, when carried, realizes all the expectations of its authors, we may look forward to one of the greatest changes ever yet witnessed by man in the future conduct of the Irish tenant, and his future treatment of the soil. Instead of the slovenly, reckless, hand-to-mouth half-pauper, now shuffling about his farm in rags, hoarding up every farthing he can scrape together, as if his landlord, the Government, and his neighbours had all conspired to rob him, we may expect to see a bustling, energetic, smart-looking agriculturist superintending works which he knows must repay him largely by increasing the produce of his farm.

As it is, the Irish farmer never thinks of investing his money in his land. His class is the most numerous of the depositors in the Irish banks. At this moment there are eighteen millions sterling deposited in those banks, by far the largest portion of which comes from the farmers. And this goes on accumulating

until it is expended in taking the depositors off to America or is invested in English speculations. This is a state of things on which Mr. Murphy is quite justified in expatiating; much more than in giving us a hundred pages of Irish history with a summary of civil wars, victories, subjugations, executions, and confiscations. Suppose an English author were to trace the history of the past, and enlighten us with the details of the murders and mutilations practised by the "Irish savages" of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, or were to fill a book with a summary of the lawless outrages of the last three years. Indeed it would be fairer on our author's part if he did dwell more than he does on the growing lawlessness of the Irish peasant class, which, whether it be Fenian or agrarian, is utterly unprovoked by the modern tenor of English legislation, and is presenting more formidable impediments to the agricultural settlement and prosperity of Ireland than even the most bigoted selfishness of the landlord and middleman. It would be more patriotic on the part of Mr. Murphy and other Irishmen if they protested more strongly against the suicidal wickedness of the men who abet a system of terrorism in many Irish counties, and drive every civilizing influence out of them; and if they dilated less either on the details of an obsolete despotism, or on the real or supposed advantages of the Belgian *petite culture*. Mr. Murphy cannot be ignorant that the men to whose prejudices he panders by these reminiscences desire, not the agricultural improvement of Ireland, but the partition of its soil; and that a multiplication of the small holdings which he eulogizes could only reproduce the series of evils which were revealed by the Devon Commission, and which culminated in the Irish famine. Furthermore, he ought to know that such phrases as "he avails of" are barbarisms, intolerable to every man who has an ordinary acquaintance with the English language.

MEMOIRS OF GENERAL BRANDT.—VOL. II.*

THE warm reception accorded to the recently published Memoirs of General Brandt speaks highly for the fair-judging spirit of the German public. His vivid description of life in the Grand Army as viewed by one who, though born a Prussian, could appreciate to the full the military qualities of Frenchmen, has interfered with the popularity of the work as little as did the fact of the author's having fought against the independence of his own nation with the success of his after life in its service. To us, who fortunately lay secure from the political storms of the first part of this century, it may seem strange that a young soldier of German birth and education, brought up with high sentiments of Prussian patriotism, should have allowed himself to bear arms under the Imperial eagles against his own people. But changes of territory made by the sword, with the acceptance of all their legal consequences, have for centuries been familiar to Continental politicians; while the doctrine of nationalities, with its result of determined hostility and refusal of all but enforced allegiance to the annexing Power, is the creation of recent years. Brandt's own work, with its severe commentary on the abiding unpopularity of German domination in North Poland, is of itself a sufficient reason why the legal rather than the sentimental view of allegiance should be adhered to in such a case as his, where Germans colonizing the debatable borders of Slavonia were torn away by the course of political events from their own land, and made Poles—or for practical purposes, as the world then was, Frenchmen—against their own will.

Beginning his career as a Prussian ensign, Brandt became in 1807 by conquest a subject of the rapidly extending federation of which Napoleon was lord paramount and absolute chief. Davoust, who governed Poland for his master, conferred a French commission on the ex-Prussian officer; and the prompt acceptance of this, and his hearty service which followed, ended only by his captivity on the bloody field of Leipsic, seem, instead of having been imputed as offences, to have been the means of bringing the late captain of the Polish Legion into honourable notice when his Imperial master had fallen, and causing a sort of contest among the victors as to whose standard he should in future follow. Until the Congress of Vienna had disposed of her fate, Poland was entrusted to the charge of that strange mixture of tyranny and softheartedness, the Grand Duke Constantine, and Brandt had hardly recovered from his Leipsic wounds when he found himself gazetted one of the senior captains in a regiment of Polish infantry then being raised in the province of Posen. But when this district was soon afterwards restored to Prussia, and Brandt's family once more became subjects of the monarchy under which they had been born, Constantine, being much in want of officers, grudged the services of one who had so thorough a military training as the ex-adjutant of Napoleon's Polish Legion, and positively refused Brandt his discharge, which was only obtained after a very warm remonstrance by the Prussian ambassador. Freed at last from allegiance to Poland, Brandt was welcomed into the service of his lawful king, and, forthwith becoming a captain in the Prussian army, spent the remainder of a prolonged and active life in promoting the efficiency of that vast machine whose success has of late changed the whole political map of Europe. His fidelity to the French standards during his period of enforced severance from Germany seems neither to have been brought against him as a reproach nor to have impeded his professional

advancement. No doubt the freedom of his criticisms on Prussian dealings with Poland caused his Memoirs to lie unpublished until after his decease, but this impartiality has not hindered the success of the work in Germany, where the first volume, containing his reminiscences of the Grand Army, has already gone through more than one edition, and is now followed by a second part, giving Brandt's recollections of the political events between the years 1828 and 1833, including much original information as to the Polish insurrection. His son, who edits both volumes, explains that for the ten years following his father's restoration to the Prussian army his services were of so routine a character that the General judged it unnecessary to record them at length, and that, as to the later part of his career, the papers bequeathed involve the characters of actors yet living, so that their present publication would be premature.

In 1828, after ten years of military life in the provinces, Brandt was suddenly ordered to Berlin to be attached as additional instructor to the Cadet Academy. This appointment he owed to General Valentini, who had heard of his success as a teacher in the War School of his division, and especially of his exertions to make his brother officers acquainted with French military literature, the study of which it had been the fashion to neglect since the overthrow of Napoleon. A constant student of his own profession, gifted with a ready pen, and combining all the advantages of his original training in a German university of the first rank with those drawn from intelligent observation during six years of continued field service under the Empire, Brandt was in every way qualified to adorn his new office. His rise in the educational department of the army was assured from the time of his first introduction to the capital, and continued steadily until interrupted by his being called to a still more important line of duty. The French revolution of 1830 had come, and its shock was felt throughout Europe. Diplomatic and warlike preparations were once more actively pursued. Brandt, now a major on the head-quarter staff, was busily employed in preparing projects for possible campaign on either frontier; and, placed by his office directly in communication with the King's private Cabinet, he mixed in his leisure hours with the Court society, and had opportunities of observing the influence and bearing of the chief diplomatists sent to Berlin. Among these was our Waterloo ally, Perponcher, faithful to the House of Orange, whose interests he strove with much tact to maintain during the events which at last gave Belgium a doubtful independence. Better known under the First Empire than the Belgian General was the ambassador from Paris, Count Lobau, who kept as cool a front in face of the war party who were for attacking the new King of the French as ever he had maintained in a desperate crisis of battle. Marshal Diebitsch, with his Turkish laurels fresh from Adrianople, was there before him, sent, as was publicly asserted, to procure Prussian co-operation for a general invasion of France when the spring of 1831 should permit the movement. The strong-handed intervention of the French Government in Belgium offered a fair excuse. The Crown Prince and others of the Royal House united their voice to Diebitsch's persuasions, and urged the support of Holland. But the soldierly simplicity of Lobau or the force of the Paris arguments prevailed, and the King resolved to do nothing against France, provided the latter attempted no aggression on the side of Germany. The Conference of London, with the Declaration of Belgian Independence, soon followed, and for the time solved the great European question. The chief result of the late uneasiness, according to Brandt, had been the discovery, by the Prussian staff, that the whole army machine had got out of working gear. Military reforms were once more in fashion, and Dreyse's celebrated needle-gun was at this early period brought to Royal notice; but the time was not ripe for such a revolution in arms.

Scarcely had the excitement caused by Belgian affairs subsided when danger arose in the opposite quarter. Insurrection broke out at Warsaw and extended through Poland. Marshal Diebitsch was forthwith summoned to St. Petersburg to take supreme command and receive the Imperial orders, and Brandt heard him repel congratulations on his appointment by the declaration that civil war was a painful thing even when victory was assured, which in Poland, he added, it could never be. The Marshal left that night, and when next seen by Brandt the latter came as the bearer of important despatches from the headquarters of a large Prussian army. Events had appeared so serious at Berlin, as the insurrection continued to grow, and the populace of Paris to declare their sympathy with it in fierce riots, that the Cabinet of Frederic William III. resolved to mobilize the whole force of the Eastern half of the kingdom, with the double view of overawing Prussian Poland and of having a field army ready to meet any movement from France. Marshal Gneisenau, the trusted factotum of Blücher in wars gone by, and still a hale old man, was naturally placed in command; and Brandt's local knowledge promising to be of special value, he was ordered at the Marshal's request to join the staff of the army, and arrived at Posen, the chosen headquarters, just before his chief. The Prussian outposts lay for some time close to those of Diebitsch, and the latter at first showed the same jealousy of this large force watching him upon his flank as Gortschakoff, with better reason, of the threatening position of the Austrians on the Danube in 1854. It was the more necessary to undeceive him as Gneisenau's own reputation for impulsive action was an element in the Russian doubts; and the task of verbally assuring Diebitsch that the attitude assumed by Prussia was simply defensive was confided to Brandt, who accomplished it with perfect success, and has bequeathed a very interesting account of his

* Aus dem Leben des Generals (Dr.) Heinrich von Brandt. Zweiter Theil. Berlin: Mittler.

mission. Prussia succeeded to the end in maintaining her armed neutrality, if indeed that can be called neutrality which, in order to strike *sub rosa* at the revolution and keep Diebitsch in good humour, permitted him at the most critical period of the struggle to supply his army through Prussian ports. Whatever may be thought of the means, the design completely succeeded of averting the war which Humboldt himself had deemed inevitable.

We have left ourselves insufficient space to speak of the rest of the period covered by this new volume of the Memoirs, which contains much that is interesting as to Brandt's advocacy of the Royal views in the Berlin press, his mission to Paris to report officially on the condition of the French army under the Orleanist régime, and as to the many historical personages whom he met on familiar terms. To those who are acquainted with the First Part of the work it is sufficient to say that this is hardly inferior to it in the independence of thought and keenness of observation which have won just honour for the autobiographer in the field of European literature. If it is of less striking interest, it is because Brandt is telling us of his share in the struggles of a period which, though stormy enough, seems calm when compared with the time when a Jena or Leipsic changed the face of Europe in a day.

NO APPEAL.

THIS novel has some decided merits, counterbalanced by equally decided defects. No one will think lightly of this degree of praise who has been condemned to wade through much of the modern literature of fiction. We may add that the merit is of a kind which seems to be daily growing rarer. The majority of modern novels are wearisome to the reader because they have evidently been wearisome to the writer. They are not the fruits of a spontaneous impulse to reproduce the impressions and utter the thoughts of the author, but a feeble attempt to galvanize into partial activity some of those dreary old scenes and characters which have been used up in so many novels now happily dead and buried. We have the same sense of disgust which we sometimes feel at the play, when we recognise the poor old theatrical properties that are being brought out for the hundredth time in the hope of passing muster by some superficial alteration. Now *No Appeal* has at least the virtue of freshness. The author has no very great originality; he has little new light to throw upon human life or natural scenery, and no remarkable powers of observation. But somehow he contrives to exhibit a genuine interest in his story, and therefore succeeds more or less in carrying us along with him. Subject to certain deductions to be presently made, we may say that he avoids the deadliest sin of which a novelist can be guilty, that of dullness. The scene of the story is laid in Devonshire, in some rather indefinite town upon the south coast; and though there is not much direct description and very little of that detestable art known as "word-painting," there is enough local colour to remind us throughout of one of the most charming districts in England. The fishermen, the country doctors, the clergy, and most of the persons concerned, have a strong flavour of the soil, and the streams and moors and picturesque country-houses of that old-fashioned region form a pleasant and inobtrusive background. It is difficult to define the precise charm thus communicated, and we could hardly quote passages long enough to be fair practical exemplifications. We need only say that people who have wandered through Devonshire lanes, climbed the heights of Dartmoor, and cruised off Plymouth and Torquay will find that *No Appeal* harmonizes very well with the spirit of the scenery. We may add that the story is on the whole well conceived, and told with a fair amount of skill. There are indeed one or two digressions, chiefly provoked, as it would seem, by the intense disgust which the author cherishes for Dissenting preachers, with which we might be inclined to find fault. We have no desire to undertake the defence of ranting hypocrites whose preaching is composed in equal parts of lively descriptions of hell-fire and racy anecdotes of their own evil deeds whilst still unconverted, nor do we care to inquire how many originals might be found for so unpleasant a portrait. But, from a purely artistic point of view, it is generally more agreeable to have to do with human beings, and not with such sensual and degraded wolves in sheep's clothing as Romish priests according to Garibaldi, or Dissenting preachers according to the author of *No Appeal*. There is nothing more antagonistic to the proper artistic frame of mind, which seeks out by preference the picturesque and human sides of every character, than a violent class antipathy, however reasonable. When not under the influence of this passion the author manages to develop his story with as little clumsiness as most English novelists.

But—for we must turn to the other side—there is a blunder through the whole novel which we had fondly hoped was beginning to be out of date. It is written to enforce a moral, or rather, we should say, to raise a question in morality; and with the usual unsatisfactory results. The difficulty upon which the story turns is as follows. A young lady, whom the author supposes to be exquisitely beautiful, virtuous, and attractive, is loved by two young men—a straightforward, honourable country doctor, and a lying, cowardly country gentleman. She naturally prefers the sneak, and marries him. It then turns out that her husband has been

guilty, before her marriage, of seducing a beautiful fisherman's daughter; and that he has, very cruelly but not very unnaturally, endeavoured to get his mistress out of the way, and made her a sufficient allowance to live comfortably in a retired village. By a singular coincidence, however, the cast-off mistress comes to live in his house as a maid, and has an explanation with the wife. They both agree that they have been abominably ill-treated, and combine, from a lofty sense of duty, to bully the man who has been the lover of one and is the husband of the other. The wife, however, is terribly perplexed as to her duty. She tries to clear up her mind by consulting the honourable man whom she had previously rejected, and an equally honourable clergyman in the neighbourhood. They are all terribly perplexed and distressed. The author works himself up to most indignant invectives against the cruelty and want of Christianity in English laws. "Was there no appeal for her?" he asks, and he replies in capital letters "None." If she, he says, had "committed one fault a hundredfold less in guilt than this bold, brazen, heartless, lying treachery and guilt of her husband, she would have been instantly cast out into the street with righteous scorn He is a man; and to him the paths of guilt, if not openly lawful, are tacitly permitted." We shall not discuss the very old question as to the relative value set upon chastity amongst men and amongst women, or even the merits of marriage laws in England; but the author seems rather to lose his head in the vehemence of his indignation. If the lady had committed the same sin as her husband before marriage, he would have been no more able to free himself than she was; and it would lead to very singular results if any other rule was possible. If a wife could turn off her husband because she found that he had been immoral before his marriage, and told lies to conceal it afterwards, the laws of divorce must be considerably relaxed. The lady's two advisers are in fact compelled to tell her what every sane person would have told her in real life—namely, that she must return to her husband, and live with him and her child as comfortably as possible under the circumstances. They might have added, what does not seem to have occurred to them, that the ex-mistress should be returned to the poor old father whose heart had been broken by her flight. For some reason nothing is said about this, and the very uncomfortable family party continues. The deserted mistress, the deceived wife, and the lying husband live on in the same house, hating and defying each other. When such things happen in real life, they do not generally lead to such tragical quarrels; but it is fair to add that the husband is so confirmed a liar as to be more contemptible than might be inferred from his vices. We thus have a situation, not very agreeable it must be confessed, but such as not unfrequently occurs in other novels. The exquisitely pure and beautiful woman tied to a man totally unworthy of her has tried the talents of innumerable writers. Mrs. Osborne, for example, in *Vanity Fair*, is in much the same position as Mrs. Frank Stone in *No Appeal*, and Willy Fitzgerald plays the part of the faithful Dobbin. Thackeray made his heroine shut her eyes to the faults of her deceased husband, and continue to believe for years after his death that he was one of the noblest of mankind. The author of *No Appeal* prefers that his heroine should be clearer-sighted, and, in fact, allows the model person to write a letter to her in which he speaks of her husband, apparently with her full sympathy, as a scoundrel. If this rather diminishes our interest in a lady who can so easily cast off her youthful illusions, it certainly affords an opportunity for some pathetic scenes. But what is to be done? The characters are, so to speak, at a deadlock, and there is a difficulty in obtaining a satisfactory solution without cutting the knot. A great writer would probably have accepted the situation, and not have shrunk from painting hopeless misery borne with touching resignation; a French novelist would have discovered an easier solution, which would have made short work with certain canons of morality; but an English novelist of the average standard is always bound to be moral, and to bring about a happy conclusion. Consequently, the author of *No Appeal* puts up with the ordinary expedient of writers of his kind. He brings Providence to bear upon his villains with tremendous energy. The wicked young man meets the virtuous young man by the side of a stream; he is provoked to strike him with a stick by the admirable coolness of his former rival; a Scotch terrier, endowed for the occasion with a truly admirable sense of the proprieties, bites the villain's leg at the critical moment; he misses his blow, topples over into the stream, and then comes into contact with certain stakes, ostensibly provided for the benefit of poachers, but really designed by Providence for the extirpation of villains. Even this is not sufficient. The villain is saved by the disinterested efforts of his virtuous rival, is carried home, and there slowly killed by an illness judiciously spread out over several pages. His shrieks, curses, and ribaldry are only less edifying than his occasional outbursts of repentance; and when he finally makes his exit from the world we are left in a pleasant state of doubt as to whether his sufferings have or have not produced a beneficial change of mind.

So far we only regret that the novelist has chosen the easy instead of the most impressive mode of conducting his story. The temptation is one to which so many novelists have already yielded, and are likely to yield in future, that we should not be too severe in our judgment. Yet it is rather annoying that the moral question is left after all in uncertainty. What is a virtuous and attractive woman to do when she is married to a vicious and repulsive husband? She cannot count upon his tumbling into a stream and having a stake stuck into his eye. Husbands of cold hearts

* *No Appeal*. A Novel. By the Author of "Cut Down like Grass." 3 vols. London: Longmans & Co. 1870.

and irregular propensities frequently live long enough to see their wives into the grave, and even die very happily at the end of their evil courses. This is the misfortune which inevitably attends the mixing of story-telling with casuistry. The disputed point is left uncertain, and the story is distorted so as to evade the most telling situations. We will only observe upon the moral question that, in our opinion, wives ought to live with their husbands even if it should be proved that their conduct has formerly been highly reprehensible, and that their character is still not so good as was supposed on the wedding-day; and the fact that great hardships may result from hasty marriages to bad young men is not sufficient to prove that our laws are un-Christian and tyrannical. But such distinctions are out of place in criticizing a novel, though the author in this case appears to be desirous of forcing them upon us.

We will therefore conclude with the remark that the novel, which up to this point had been amusing, now becomes rather stupid from a further necessity of the case. It is obvious that the young lady, having gone through her period of torture, is to be rewarded by marrying the really good young man. However, the author has a dim sense that she should not appear to be in too great a hurry. Accordingly, he spins out his narrative through another half volume, in which a few incidents occur, uninteresting by themselves and totally irrelevant to all that has gone before—the good young man being taken up to London, apparently to give room for the description of a low music-hall. After two or three proposals, which the heroine receives in such a way as to make us regard her as something of a coquette and considerably wanting in common sense, the virtuous people are successfully rewarded; whilst Providence brings the injured girl into relations with her family by a surprising series of coincidences (which are the more remarkable as she was all the time within six or seven miles of them), and the whole business is satisfactorily wound up. If, on another occasion, the author avoids attempting the solution of moral and social problems, and is a little more careful of the artistic proprieties of his story, he will write a more interesting novel; but, even as it is, it may be reckoned as decidedly superior to the average.

NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.

The SATURDAY REVIEW is duly registered for transmission abroad.

The publication of the SATURDAY REVIEW takes place on Saturday mornings, in time for the early trains, and copies may be obtained in the Country, through any Newsagent, on the day of publication.

Nearly all the back Numbers of the SATURDAY REVIEW may be obtained through any Bookseller, or of the Publisher, at the Office, 38 Southampton Street, Strand, W.C., to whom all Communications relating to Advertisements should likewise be addressed.

Now ready, VOLUME XXVIII., bound in cloth, price 16s. Cloth Cases for Binding all the Volumes, price 2s. each. Also, Reading Cases, price 2s. 6d. each. May be had at the Office, or through any Bookseller.

THE SATURDAY REVIEW

OF

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d. unstamped; or 7d. stamped.

CONTENTS OF No. 750, MARCH 12, 1870:

- The Debate. The End of the Dual Government.
The Malt-Tax. The Irish Members and the Land Bill.
The Council and the Catholic Powers. The Naturalization Bill.
Conservatives in the City.
- Mathematicians under a Cloud.
Episcopal Signatures. The Shrieking Sisterhood.
The Prospects of the Education Bill. Montalambert on the Revival of Gallicanism.
The Treatment of Lunatics.
Present Phase of the Scotch Education Question.
The Priene Marbles. *Pep o' Day.*
- Casimir Marcellina. Systems of Land Tenure.
Farrar's Families of Speech. Life and Remains of Dr. Robert Lee.
The Castles of Herefordshire and their Lords.
Ireland: Industrial, Political, and Social. Memoirs of General Brandt.
No Appeal.

CONTENTS OF No. 749, MARCH 5, 1870:

- The Government and Irish Crime—The Chinese Treaty—The Irish Elections—The Appellate Jurisdiction Bill—Imperialists in Opposition—The Reception of the Land Bill—Deputations to the Exchequer—The Abuse of the Competitive System—The Navy Estimates.
- The Parson of the Old Novelist—The *Edinburgh Review* and the Earls of Bedford—The Inspired Schoolboy of Politics—State Aid to Emigration—Railway Liability—St. George's, Hanover Square—Textile Fabrics at the India Museum—The Royal Forests—Perfect Unanimity in Council—Spring Exhibitions—A Bull-Fight at Islington.
- Greg's Political Problems—Dr. Letheby on Food—Garibaldi's Rule of the Monk—Finlason's Hereditary Dignities—Pelle's Introduction to Greek and Latin Etymology—Roland Yorke—Judeo-Arabic Metaphysics—French Literature.

London: Published at 38 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

ITALIAN OPERA.—THEATRE ROYAL DRURY LANE.
SEASON 1870.—Full particulars will be duly announced.

SATURDAY BALLAD CONCERTS, St. James's Hall.—
Director, Mr. JOHN BOOSEY.—Saturday, March 19. Artists: Madame Sherrington, Miss Edith Wynne, Mrs. Henry Barby, Madame Anna Jewell, and Madame Foley; Mr. Vernon Higby, Mr. Fielding, Mr. Chaplin Henry, and Mr. Byron. Pianoforte, Chevalier Antoine de Kontski (Pianist to the King of Prussia). Clarinet, Mr. Lazarus. The Orpheus Glee Union, under the direction of Mr. W. J. Fielding. Conductor, Mr. J. L. Hutton. Stalls, 5s.; Balcony, 3s.; Area, 2s.; Orchestra and Gallery, 1s.—Tickets to be had at St. James's Hall; of Boosey & Co., Holles Street; and the usual Musicallers.

SATURDAY BALLAD CONCERTS.—Chevalier ANTOINE DE KONTSKI, Pianist to the King of Prussia, will make his Fifth Appearance on Saturday next.

PHILHARMONIC SOCIETY.—Conductor, Mr. W. G. CUSINS.
Wednesday Evening, March 16, St. James's Hall. Symphonies (MS.) composed for the Society, Cherubini, and C minor, Beethoven; Concerto for Violin, Madlle. Norman-Néruda, Mendelssohn; Overtures, "Fidelio," Beethoven, and "Der Freischütz," Weber; and Vocal Music. Stalls, 10s. 6d. and 7s.; Unreserved, 5s. and 2s. 6d.—Lamborn Cook & Co.'s, 69 New Bond Street; Austin's Ticket Office, St. James's Hall; Mitchell's; Bubb's; Olivier's; Chapell's; Keith, Frowse, & Co.'s; and Alfred Hays' Ticket Offices.

THE SOCIETY of PAINTERS in WATER-COLOURS.—
The WINTER EXHIBITION of SKETCHES and STUDIES will CLOSE on Saturday, March 19. 5 Pall Mall East. Ten till Dusk.—Admission, 1s.
WILLIAM CALLOW, Secretary.

SOCIETY of FEMALE ARTISTS' GALLERY, 9 Conduit Street.—EXHIBITION of WORKS NOW OPEN, including St. Hubert Stag, by Rosa Bonheur.—Admission, 1s.

GUSTAVE DORÉ.—DORÉ GALLERY, 35 New Bond Street.
EXHIBITION of PICTURES (including "ROSSINI," "TITANIA," "FRANCISCA DE RIMINI," &c.), Daily, at the New Gallery, from Ten to Five.—Admission, 1s.

WILL CLOSE APRIL 5.
ELIJAH WALTON'S ALPINE and EGYPTIAN PICTURES.—The WINTER EXHIBITION NOW OPEN at the Pall Mall Gallery, 49 Pall Mall (Mr. W. M. Thompson's). Admission, 1s.—From Ten till Six.

LONDON INSTITUTION, Finsbury Circus.—NOTICE is
Hereby Given, that at the FOURTH SOIRÉE, on Wednesday, March 16, a LECTURE on ANCIENT ARMS and ARMOUR will be delivered by J. G. WALLER, Esq.
The lecture will commence at Half-past Six, the Lecture at Eight.

By Order, THOMAS PIPER, Hon. Sec.

MARLBOROUGH COLLEGE, March 1870.—TWELVE
SCHOLARSHIPS, varying in value from £20 to £16 a year, besides a certain number of FREE ADMISSIONS, each worth £20, will be competed for early in June next. These Scholarships are open to Members of the School and others without distinction. Two will be offered for proficiency in Mathematics. Age of Candidates from Twelve to Sixteen.—Full particulars may be obtained on application to Mr. SELICK, the College, Marlborough.

DULWICH COLLEGE.—The next EXAMINATION for
Admission to the UPPER SCHOOL will be held at the College, on Saturday, March 19, at Ten o'clock A.M.
Scholarships tenable at the College, and Exhibitions for Students of any Profession or of the Fine Arts, have recently been established.
For particulars of the Examination, Subjects of Instruction, Terms for Day Boys and Boarders, &c., apply to the SCHOOL SECRETARY, Dulwich College, S.E.

MALVERN COLLEGE.—The NEXT TERM will commence
on Wednesday, May 4.

RADLEY COLLEGE.
Visitor.—The Lord Bishop of OXFORD.

His Grace the Duke of MARLBOROUGH.
Trustees.
The Right Hon. Sir ROBERT PHILLIPS, M.P., D.C.L. J. G. HUBBARD, Esq.
The Lord RICHARD CAVENTISH. The Hon. CHARLES L. WOOD.
The WARDEN of All Souls Coll. Oxford. HENRY BARNETT, Esq., M.P.

Warden.—Rev. WILLIAM WOOD, D.D., late Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.
Sub-Warden.—Rev. EDWARD WORSLEY, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford.
And Eight Assistant Masters.
BOYS are prepared for the Universities, the Competitive Examinations, the Army, Navy, and Mercantile Pursuits.
Terms, 100 Guineas per Annum.
Application to be made to the WARDEN, Radley College, Abingdon.

THE LONDON FEVER HOSPITAL, for the Reception
of Relapsing and other Contagious Fevers. Nearly 400 Patients are now under Treatment within its Walls, including 200 Cases of Relapsing Fever.
Subscriptions and Donations will be gratefully received by Messrs. Dimsdale & Co. 20 Cornhill; Messrs. Drummond, Charing Cross; Messrs. Coutts & Co., Strand; Messrs. Hoare, Fleet Street; and by the Secretary, at the Hospital, Liverpool Road, Islington.

HOMELESS BOYS of LONDON and REFUGES for
HOMELESS and DESTITUTE CHILDREN.—FUNDS are greatly needed for the Purchase of Food and Clothing for the
20 Boys on board the Chichester Training Ship.
100 Boys in the Refuge, 8 Great Queen Street.
100 Boys in the Country Home.
110 Girls in the Refuge, 19 Broad Street, and Ealing.
510 Children.

£15 will keep a Boy or a Girl for One Year, and £1 5s. for a Month.
Contributions thankfully received by the London and Westminster Bank, 214 High Holborn, W.C.; and 41 Lothbury, E.C.; and by
WILLIAM WILLIAMS, Secretary,
8 Great Queen Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields, W.C.

METROPOLITAN CONVALESCENT INSTITUTION.
Asylum, Walton-on-Thames.

CHILDREN'S BRANCH, the Burroughs, Hendon, N.W.
President.—His Grace the Duke of WELLINGTON.
Treasurers.—Right Hon. RUSSELL GURNEY, M.P., Q.C.; Major W. LYON.

Chairman.—Colonel W. F. GRANT.
Bankers.—LONDON JOINT-STOCK BANK, 69 Pall Mall.
Convalescent Boys from Two to Ten, Girls from Two to Fourteen, are now admissible to the Convalescent Home at Hendon.
Donations and Subscriptions are earnestly solicited to meet the increased current expenditure.

Office, 22 Sackville Street, Piccadilly. CHARLES HOLMES, Secretary.
ROYAL HOSPITAL for DISEASES of the CHEST, City
Road.—ASSISTANCE is greatly needed to meet the heavy current Expenses of the Hospital. Bankers.—GLYN & CO. CHARLES L. KEMP, Secretary.

MSS. to COPY WANTED, by a LADY who Writes a
Clear Hand. Moderate terms. Unexceptionable References.—Address, M. B., care of Messrs. Spottiswoode & Co., Printers and Law Stationers, 30 Parliament Street, S.W.

PICTURES, BRONZES, and WORKS of ART on SALE at
Southampton Street, Strand. Pictures Cleaned, Lined, and Restored, if in the worst condition. Frames Cleaned or Regilt equal to New. Sales attended on Commission.
CHARLES DEAR, 39 Southampton Street, Strand.

LONDON UNIVERSITY MATRICULATION, June 1870.—Mr. HANBURY, M.A., Wrangler and late Senior Scholar of his College, will commence READING with a CLASS for the above Examination about the middle of this month. He is assisted by efficient Lecturers in French and Chemistry, and has passed Twenty-four Pupils during the last Three years. Fee for the Course, 10 Guineas.—For further particulars, address 21 Old Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.

INDIAN TELEGRAPH, WORKS, FORESTS, HOME CIVIL SERVICE, and ARMY.—Mr. W. M. LUPTON (Author of "English History and Arithmetic"), assisted by a Gentleman in the War Office, prepares CANDIDATES for all Departments.—Address, 15 Beaufort Buildings, Strand.

ENGINEERING.—STUDENTS are prepared in the Engineering Department of the HARTLEY INSTITUTION, Southampton, for ENGINEERING in all its Branches, and for the INDIAN WORKS, TELEGRAPHIC, and FOREST SERVICES, by a complete course of instruction.—Address, The PRINCIPAL.

FOLKESTONE.—The Rev. C. L. ACLAND, M.A. of Jesus College, Cambridge, and Mr. W. J. JEAFFRESON, M.A. of Lincoln College, Oxford, late Principal of the Elphinstone Institution, Bombay, prepare PUPILS for the Indian Civil Service and other Competitive Examinations.—Terms and references on application.

THE Rev. J. BOND, M.A., late Fellow of Magdalen College, Cambridge, and Assistant-Master at Rugby, has One Vacancy for a PUPIL reading for the University. Terms, 10 Guineas.—Address, Andover Rectory, Alford.

CAREFUL PRIVATE TUITION.—The Rev. E. C. COLLARD, Alton Panera Vicarage, Dorchester, has now a few VACANCIES for PUPILS. As his number is limited to Fourteen, and he is assisted by Two Resident Tutors, the most careful, individual preparation for Public School life is insured. The strictest attention is also paid to the health and domestic comfort of the Pupils. References kindly permitted to Parents, among whom may be mentioned the Rev. Prebendary Morrice, Longbridge Deverill, Warrminster; the Rev. J. Lettis, St. Ann's Vicarage, Stansford Hill; the Ven. Archdeacon Sanstbury, Fowles, Bridport; A. Bushy, Esq., 22 Woodlands Terrace, Blackheath, &c.

GERMANY.—LADIES' COLLEGE, EISENACH, Saxe-Weimar. Founded in 1808, and Conducted by Fraulein MODER, M.C.P., who will be in London at the beginning of April. Particulars and Prospectuses kindly forwarded by: London.—L. SCHMITZ, Esq., Ph.D., LL.D., F.R.S.E., International College, Spring Grove; A. PRITCHARD, Esq., M.R.I., St. Paul's Road, Highbury; Professor SCHÄUBLE, M.D., Ph.D., Military Academy, Gießen; Manchester.—ROBERT GLADSTONE, Esq., Highfield; the Rev. W. M. KENNEDY, D.D., Upper Brook Street.

GERMANY.—INSTITUTION for the EDUCATION of YOUNG LADIES at DRESDEN. Conducted by Madame SCHUSTER, of 5 Waisenhaus Strasse.—At this School a thorough Education is given in every branch, including French and high-class Music. Terms, from Thirty-five Guineas. No Extras.—References permitted to Herr Pastor Schubert, of the Kreuz Kirche, Dresden; and F. W. Maynard, Esq., Secretary to the Arundel Society, 21 Old Bond Street, London.

EDUCATION in PARIS.—Madame HAVET, 94 Avenue d'Eylau, Bois de Boulogne, receives TEN YOUNG LADIES, to whom she offers a comfortable Home, complete Education in French, and facilities for pursuing their other Studies.—Prospectuses on application to Madame Havet's Husband, Monsieur A. HAVET, Director, Foreign Language Institute, Edinburgh.

CONTINENTAL EDUCATION.—A MARRIED CLERGYMAN (M.A. Cambridge, with Mathematical Honours) undertakes the Care and Education of a few PUPILS. Has at present Two, aged Fifteen and Sixteen. The best references.—Address, Rev. N. G. WILKINS, 19 Linmer Strasse, Hanover.

A LADY, who is a Proficient in Music, desires a RE-ENGAGEMENT for the Mornings or the Entire Day. She is also qualified to teach English in all its branches, French, German, and Drawing.—Address, M., 27 Bloomsbury Street, W.C.

A CHILD (Boy or Girl) can be received into the Family of a PROFESSIONAL MAN, residing in one of the healthiest Towns on the East Coast. Superior advantages for a Child too delicate for School life.—Address, in first instance, F. G. T., Fort Library, Margate.

EDITORIAL SECRETARY.—Wanted, by the SOCIETY for PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE, a CLERGYMAN of good Theological attainments and literary acquirements, and acquainted with Modern Languages, to act as SECRETARY to the Publishing Committees of the Society. Salary, £400 per annum. Age not to exceed Forty-five years.—Applications, with Testimonials, to be sent in to the SECRETARY of S. P. C. K., 67 Lincoln's Inn Fields, London, W.C., on or before Thursday, the 31st day of March.

GOVERNESS.—The Friends of a YOUNG LADY, just leaving School, are desirous of obtaining for her a SITUATION in a Family where the Children are young. She is in her Seventeenth year, and capable of instructing in English, French, Music, Singing, and Drawing.—Address, ALPHA, 31 Manor Road East, Lewisham High Road, S.E.

STAMMERING.—Messrs. DANZIGER & FRENCH, 21 Welbeck Street, Cavendish Square, London, W., effectually and permanently CURE all IMPEDIMENT of SPEECH, whether due to Nervousness or other Causes, irrespective of Age or Sex. No Mechanical appliances used. The highest References and Testimonials can be had on application.—No Fee unless benefit derived.

CANCER HOSPITAL, London and Brompton: 1851.—Office, 167 Piccadilly (opposite to Bond Street). In consequence of a great increase in the number of IN-PATIENTS, it has been found necessary to Open an ADDITIONAL WARD, which has necessarily entailed very considerable increased Expenditure. The Committee of Management confidently rely upon the Public enabling them, by their Support, to continue to afford Relief and Comfort to that portion of the Sick Poor suffering from this fearful Disease. Treasurer.—GEO. T. HERTSMET, Esq., St. James's Palace, S.W. Bankers.—Messrs. COTTE & CO., Strand. By Order, H. J. JUPP.

WHAT WILL THIS COST TO PRINT?—An immediate Answer to this Inquiry, and a SPECIMEN BOOK of TYPES, with Information for Authors, may be obtained on application to R. BARRETT & SONS, 13 Mark Lane.

SOLD BY ALL STATIONERS.
JOSEPH GILLOTT'S STEEL PENS.

MONOGRAMS.—The STATIONERY COMPANY'S CATALOGUE—LOGOS and SPECIMENS of MONOGRAMS and CHEAP STATIONERY, post free.—BRITISH and FOREIGN STATIONERY COMPANY, 8, 10, and 12 Garrick Street, Covent Garden, London.

RODRIGUES' MONOGRAMS, ARMS, CRESTS, and ADDRESSES Designed, and Steel Dies Engraved as Gems. RUSTIC, GROTESQUE, and ECCENTRIC MONOGRAMS artistically designed for any combination of Letters. NOTE PAPER and ENVELOPES Stamped in Colour Relief, and Illuminated in the highest Style of Art. CARD-PLATE elegantly engraved, and 100 Superfine Cards printed, for 6s. 6d. BALL PROGRAMMES and DINNER CARDS of new Designs arranged, Printed and Stamped with Crest or Address, in the latest Fashion. At HENRY RODRIGUES', 42 PICCADILLY, LONDON.

THOMAS D. MARSHALL'S WELL-MADE BOOTS.—Ladies' Kid Elastic Boots, 10s. 6d. Gentlemen's Elastic Boots for Walking or Dress, 21s. Illustrated Catalogue post-free.—THOMAS D. MARSHALL, 192 Oxford Street, London, W.

FENDERS, STOVES, KITCHEN RANGES, FIRE-IRONS, and CHIMNEY-PIECES.—Buyers of the above are requested, before finally deciding, to visit WILLIAM S. BURTON'S SHOW-ROOMS. They contain such an assortment of Fenders, Stoves, Ranges, Chimney-pieces, Fire-irons, and General Ironmongery as cannot be approached elsewhere, either for variety, novelty, beauty of design, or exquisite workmanship. Black Register Stoves from 3s. to 45s. 6d. Bright Register, with Ormolu Ornaments from 45s. to 435 10s. Bronze Fenders from 3s. 6d. to 12s. Steel and Ormolu Fenders from 43s. to 425s. Chimney-pieces from 41s. to 4100s. Fire-irons from 3s. 6d. to 44s. 6d.

LAMPS of ALL SORTS and PATTERNS.—WILLIAM S. BURTON invites inspection of this Season's show of LAMPS. The Collection of French Moderators Lamps, such as Paris, and others, is complete. The price of a complete set with Chimney and Globe, varies from 5s. to 17s. 17s. Each Lamp is guaranteed perfect; but to insure their proper action, WILLIAM S. BURTON supplies pure Colza Oil at the wholesale price, 3s. 9d. per gallon. Moderators, Globes, full size, 2s. 6d. each. Chimneys, 6d. each. Cotton Wicks, 3d. per dozen. Lamps of all other descriptions on show in great variety. WILLIAM S. BURTON, Furnishing Ironmonger, by appointment, to H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, sends a CATALOGUE containing upwards of 700 Illustrations of his unrivalled Stock, with Lists of Prices and Plans of the 20 large Show-rooms, post free.—39 Oxford Street, W.; 1, 1A, 2, 3, and 4 Newman Street; 4, 5, and 6 Perry's Place; and 1 Newman Yard. With the present RAILWAY FACILITIES the cost of delivering Goods to the most distant parts of the United Kingdom is trifling. WILLIAM S. BURTON will always, when desired, undertake delivery at a small fixed rate.

LADY SUPERINTENDENT of a FEMALE NATIVE SCHOOL in INDIA.—The GOVERNMENT of MADRAS is desirous of obtaining the Services of a LADY for the Superintendence of the MADRAS FEMALE NORMAL SCHOOL, which will be established in the course of the present Year.

The Madras Government states that the Lady appointed "should, besides possessing a good education and a power of conveying instruction, have a facility in acquiring a foreign language; because, until the Superintendent has a competent knowledge of a vernacular language, she will be of comparatively little use in teaching."

The Lady to be selected should also possess a knowledge of Music and of Elementary Singing, but the latter qualification is not indispensable. If, in addition, she were able to teach the Elements of Drawing, such an accomplishment would, the Madras Government states, be hereafter found of great advantage.

Above all, it is stated, the Lady should be an active and earnest woman, feeling a real interest in the very important work which is to be assigned to her. Her age should not exceed Thirty-five years.

The Salary attached to the appointment will be £300 per annum, with an allowance of 600 for Carriage-hire. A sum of £150 will be given to the Lady selected for Outfit and Passage-money. She will be required to enter into the usual agreement to serve in the appointment for a period Five of Years.

Applications, with Copies of Testimonials, to be addressed to the PRIVATE SECRETARY to the Under Secretary of State for India, India Office, Westminster.

(Signed) M. E. GRANT DUFF.

UNIVERSITY of OTAGO, NEW ZEALAND.—The Council of this University are now prepared to consider Applications from CANDIDATES for Two of the PROFESSORIAL CHAIRS which they have resolved to institute—viz. in Classics, including Greek, Latin, and the English Language and Literature; and 2nd, in Mathematics and Natural Philosophy.

The Salary attached to each Chair will be £600 per annum, which will commence to run from the date of Embarcation, besides the Class Fees, which have been fixed at £25, for attendance on each Professor, per term of Six Months, commencing in the beginning of May of each Year. An adequate allowance will be made for Passage Money and Outfit.

All Candidates must be Graduates of some established and recognised University. No religious test will, however, be required from any Person to entitle him to hold office in the University, or to graduate or to hold any advantage or privilege thereof.

Applications from Candidates must be addressed to JOHN AULD, Esq., W.S., Edinburgh, Agent of the Province of Otago in Britain, and must be accompanied with Testimonials and Certificates. They must be in his hands on or before the First Day of April next.

Further information relative to the University and the Statistics of the Province will be afforded on application to the Agent.

60 Prince Street, Edinburgh, February 5, 1870.

MONTE CRISTO CATTLE STATION, CURTIS ISLAND, Queensland.—This eligible PROPERTY, consisting of a well grassed and watered CATTLE RUN of Eighty-eight Square Miles, with pre-emptive right to purchase of 125 Acres, Dwelling-house, Offices, Stock Yards, &c., newly erected, and comprising all modern improvements, with a well-selected mob of Cattle, will be SOLD BY AUCTION at Sydney, New South Wales, in the month of June next, unless previously disposed of by Private Contract. This Station offers a most eligible opportunity for realizing a Fortune in a few Years.—For Plan, and further particulars, apply to Messrs. WESTALL & ROBERTS, 7 Leadenhall Street, London, E.C.

QUEENSLAND.

QUEENSLAND under the LAND ACT of 1868, and the IMMIGRATION ACT of 1869. Land acquired on easy Terms. Assisted and Free Passages. Information and particulars to be obtained on application.

JOHN DOUGLAS, Agent-General, Queensland Government Offices, 32 Charing Cross (Removed from 2 Old Broad Street).

BRIGHTON.—BEDFORD HOTEL.—Every endeavour is made to render this Hotel equal to its long-existing repute. Spacious Coffee Room for Ladies and Gentlemen. Families received at moderate Contract Charge by the Week.—Communications to "THE MANAGER," Bedford Hotel Company, Limited.

SEA-SIDE.—EARLY SPRING.—ILFRACOMBE HOTEL.—Delightfully located on the margin of the Sea, and very enjoyable in Early Spring.—Address, J. BONS, Ilfracombe, North Devon.

HYDROPATHIC SANATORIUM, Sudbrook Park, Richmond Hill, S.W. Physician—Dr. EDWARD LANE, M.A., M.D. Edin. Turkish Baths on the Premises.

NOTICE.—FURNITURE and CARPETS.—SALE of SURPLUS STOCK.

In order to give place to their Special Designs for this Season, JOHN HENRY SMEE & COMPANY are for the present selling, at MUCH REDUCED PRICES (for such quantities only of each Pattern as they may have in Stock),

PLAIN MAHOGANY and WALNUT FURNITURE of best make, and the whole of their Last Season's Stock of BRUSSELS CARPETS.

They invite inspection of their Warehouses.

ENTRANCE—No. 20 FINSBURY PAVEMENT, MOORGATE TERMINUS.

S MEE'S SPRING MATTRESS.

Patents Nos. 1121 and 3041.

Each Mattress bears the Makers' Label.

To be obtained (price from 25s.) of most respectable Upholsterers, and of the Makers.

WILLIAM A. & SYLVANUS SMEE,

6 FINSBURY PAVEMENT, LONDON, E.C.

MAPIN & WEBB'S CANTEN CASES and PLATE

CHESTS completely fitted for Home and Foreign Use.

OAK, IRON-BOUND, and WELL-SEASONED.

First size, 45 6s.; Second, 45 8s.; Third, 41 11s.; Fourth, 41 10s.; Fifth, 42s.; Sixth, 42s. Illustrated Catalogues post free.

71 and 72 CORNHILL, and 76, 77, and 78 OXFORD STREET.

MAPPIN & WEBB'S ELECTRO-SILVER PLATE,

Quality guaranteed.

CAN BE SEEN in COURSE of MANUFACTURE at the

WORKS, SHEFFIELD.

FURNISH your HOUSE with the BEST ARTICLES; they are the Cheapest in the End.—DEANE & CO.'s New ILLUSTRATED CATALOGUE, with Priced FURNISHING LIST, gratis and post-free. This List is arranged to facilitate Purchasers in the Selection of Goods, comprises Table Cutlery, Electro-Plate, Lamps, Baths, Stoves, Fenders, Fire-irons, Brass and Iron Bedsteads, Bedding, Copper, Tin, and Brass Goods, Culinary Utensils, Turnery, Brushes, Mats, &c. A Discount of 5 per cent. for Cash Payments £2 and upwards.—DEANE & CO., 46 King William Street, London Bridge. A.D. 1700.

CASTLES and MANSIONS having defective FLAT ROOFS

can be made permanently Watertight by the application of

PYRIMONT ASPHALTE, into "Claridge's Patent."

A LIST of WORKS to which this Material has been applied for FLOORS and ROOFS for upwards of Thirty Years can be had post-free on application to

J. FARRELL, Secretary, Parliament Street, London.

FRAGRANT SOAP.—FIELD'S "UNITED SERVICE"

SOAP TABLETS, 4d. and 6d. each. Lasting fragrance guaranteed; order of your Chemist, Grocer, or Oilman, and see that J. C. & J. FIELD is on each Tablet. Wholesale.—UPPER MARSH, LAMBETH, S.E.

DR. LOCOCK'S WAFERS.—"I had been suffering for a considerable time with a most severe Cold and Cough; whenever I had a most violent fit of Coughing, I was very much distressed, and as if by a charm, the Cough ceased."—From Mr. THOS. TRANTLES, Jet Works, Staithes, Yorkshire.—Sold by all Druggists at 1s. 1d. per Box.

In the SPRING PARR'S LIFE PILLS are used by Thousands. They clear from the Body all hurtful Impurities, promote Appetite, aid Digestion, purify the Blood, and keep the Bowels regular.

The mild, pleasant action, and powerful curative properties of PARR'S HERBAL MEDICINE, recommended as the most useful remedy for the restoration of sound Bodily Health and Mental Vigour.

THE AGRA BANK, Limited.—Established in 1833.
CAPITAL, £1,000,000.

HEAD OFFICE—NICHOLAS LANE, LOMBARD STREET, LONDON.

Branches—Messrs. GLYN, MILLS, CURRIE & CO., and BANK OF ENGLAND.
BRANCHES in Edinburgh, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Kurrachee, Agra, Lahore, Shanghai, Hong Kong.

Current Accounts are kept at the Head Office on the Terms customary with London Bankers, and Interest allowed when the Credit Balance does not fall below £100.

Deposits received for fixed periods on the following terms, viz.:

At 5 per cent. per ann., subject to 12 months' Notice of Withdrawal.	
At 4 ditto ditto ditto ditto ditto	
At 3 ditto ditto ditto ditto ditto	

Exceptional Rates for longer periods than Twelve Months, particulars of which may be obtained on application.

Bills issued at the current exchange of the day on any of the Branches of the Bank, free of extra charge; and Approved Bills purchased or sent for collection.

Sales and Purchases effected in British and Foreign Securities, in East India Stock and Loans, and the safe custody of the same undertaken.

Interest drawn, and Army, Navy, and Civil Pay and Pensions realized.

Every other description of Banking Business and Money Agency, British and Indian, transacted.

J. THOMSON, Chairman.

PHENIX FIRE OFFICE, Lombard Street and Charing Cross.
Established 1782.

Insurances effected in all parts of the World.

Prompt and liberal Loss Settlements.

The whole Fire Insurance Duty is now Remitted.

GEO. W. LOVELL, Secretary.

LEGAL and GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY,
10 FLEET STREET, TEMPLE BAR, E.C.

Policies of this Society are guaranteed by very ample Funds; receive Nine-tenths of the total Profits as Bonus; enjoy peculiar "Whole World" and other distinctive privileges; and are protected by special conditions against liability to future question.

FINANCIAL POSITION ON JANUARY 1, 1870.

Annual Income	£210,000
Invested Funds	1,583,000
Existing Assurances	4,200,000
Reversionary Bonus thereon	510,000
Assurance Claims and Bonus paid	1,750,000
Share Capital fully subscribed	1,000,000
Paid up	100,000

Annual Accounts have always been published in full detail.

Loans are granted on the Security of Life Interests or Reversions.

E. A. NEWTON, Actuary and Manager.

HAND-IN-HAND FIRE and LIFE INSURANCE SOCIETY.
1 NEW BRIDGE STREET, BLACKFRIARS, LONDON, E.C.

The Oldest Insurance Office in existence. Founded and still conducted on the Mutual System.

Large Returns made to Members in each Department.

The whole of the Profits are divided annually amongst the Members of Five years' standing and upwards—there being no Shareholders.

The rate of abatement of Premium thereby given for the current year on Life Policies is 10 per cent. for the Old Series, and 50 per cent. for the New Series.

The rate of return on Septennial Fire Policies (charged at 1s. 6d. per cent.) is 96 per cent.

The Directors are willing to appoint as Agents persons of good position and character.

December 31, 1869.

Claims paid on Life Policies to this date	£216,106
Returned in Abatement of Premiums ditto	600,773

ASSETS.

Accumulated Fund	£1,290,626
Present Value of Life Premiums	1,309,323

LIABILITIES.

Present Value of Sums Insured (£3,216,547)	£1,560,800
Present Value of Life Annuities (£9,065 per annum)	63,565

Further details as to the Assets and Liabilities of the Office may be had on application to the Secretary.

IMPERIAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.
CHIEF OFFICE—1 OLD BROAD STREET, LONDON.

BRANCH OFFICE—16 PALL MALL, LONDON.

INSTITUTED 1820.

The Liabilities are, in respect of Sums Assured and Bonuses, £2,750,000; and in respect of Annuities only £250 per annum.

The Assets actually invested in First-class Securities amount to £972,521.

Of the Subscribed Capital of £750,000, only £75,000 is paid up.

All kinds of Assurance effected at moderate rates and on very liberal conditions.

Prospectus and Balance Sheet to be had on application.

ANDREW BADEN, Actuary and Manager.

IMPERIAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY,
1 OLD BROAD STREET, E.C., and 16 and 17 PALL MALL, S.W.

INSTITUTED 1805.

CAPITAL, £1,000,000. PAID UP AND INVESTED, £700,000.

Insurances against Fire can be effected with this Company on every description of Property, at moderate rates of premium.

The recent abolition of the duty on Fire Insurance should induce Policy-holders and all intending Insurers to protect themselves fully from loss by Fire, which can now be done at a net annual cost of from 1s. 6d. per cent. upwards.

Septennial Policies charged only Six Years' Premium.

Prompt and liberal Settlement of Claims.

The usual Commission allowed on Foreign and Ship Insurances.

JAMES HOLLAND, Superintendent.

THE LONDON ASSURANCE CORPORATION
For MARINE, FIRE, and LIFE ASSURANCES.

Incorporated by Royal Charter A.D. 1720.

OFFICES—7 ROYAL EXCHANGE, and 7 PALL MALL.

JAMES BLYTH, Esq., Governor.

EDWIN GOWER, Esq., Sub-Governor.

DAVID POWELL, Esq., Deputy-Governor.

Total Funds on December 31, 1869 £2,515,529

LIFE DEPARTMENT.

Policies in force for	£4,865,823
-----------------------	------------

(Exclusive of Bonus Additions.)

Income—Premiums	£161,381
Interest	56,394

Accumulated Premiums	£1,242,472
----------------------	------------

Further information may be obtained on application.

JOHN P. LAURENCE, Secretary.

ROCK LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY.
ESTABLISHED A.D. 1806.

15 NEW BRIDGE STREET, BLACKFRIARS, LONDON, E.C.

Directors.

G. P. Bidder, Esq.
J. G. Dodson, Esq., M.P.
D. A. Freeman, Esq.
G. A. Fuller, Esq.
J. Goldard, Esq.
R. Hudson, Esq., F.R.S.
J. Kell, Esq.
S. Laurence, Esq.
T. H. Longden, Esq.Lieut.-Gen. Sir G. St. P. Lawrence,
K.C.S.I., C.B.
C. T. Lucas, Esq.
J. D. Magens, Esq.
C. Rivas, Esq.
W. B. Towne, Esq.
H. Tritton, Esq.
S. H. Twining, Esq.

The ROCK LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY, which has been established upwards of Half a Century, has an Accumulated Fund of more than THREE MILLIONS STERLING, invested in Mortgages on Land, and other first-class Securities:

Viz. on August 20, 1868	£3,172,604 15 8
Sum Assured, inclusive of Bonus Additions—at that date	5,380,750 2 11
Estimated Liability thereon (Northampton Table of Mortality, 3 per cent. Interest)	1,481,589 0 4

That is less than one-half the Fund invested.

Total Amount of Bonus Additions made to Policies	2,895,059 19 9
Amount of Profits divided for the Seven Years ending 20th August, 1868	532,369 7 8
Annual Income	314,867 14 3
Total Claims paid, inclusive of Bonus Additions	6,637,044 7 7

Copies of the Annual Reports and Balance Sheets, as well as of the Periodical Valuation Accounts, Tables of Rates, and every information, to be obtained on application.

JOHN RAYDEN, Actuary.

H. W. PORTER, Sub-Actuary.

LEGAL and GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY,

No. 10 Fleet Street, London, E.C.

DIRECTORS' REPORT TO THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING,

Held at the Society's House, on Tuesday the 8th day of March, 1870.

The Year 1869, for which the Directors have now to submit their Report to the Proprietors, was the Thirty-third since the Society was established.

The principal features of the Business of the Year have been as follows:

The New Assurances effected with the Society under 152 Policies amounted to £298,275; the corresponding New Premiums amounted to £10,791 18s. 9d., of which £1660 2s. 9d. was paid away for the Re-assurance of £52,300 with other Offices, leaving £9131 16s. as the net New Premiums on £246,975, the risk retained by the Society.

The Premium Income of the Year, after deducting all Re-assurance payments, was £131,158 5s. 7d.; that of 1868, after a similar deduction, £127,268 9s. 5d.

The principal sums paid under 80 Claims by Death were £101,978. Of these, sums amounting to £88,078 were entitled to Bonus Additions, and received an increase of £23,333 7s., being at the rate of nearly 27 per cent. In 1868 the principal sums paid were £82,715 under 84 Claims. The mortality of the past Year appears to have fallen upon larger Policies, but the number of Claims is less than in either of the previous Years.

It may be satisfactory to the Proprietors to know that the total number of Claims by Death during the last Three Years has not exceeded Four-Fifths of that provided for by the Society's Tables, while the total Amount Paid during the same period has not exceeded Two-Thirds of that so provided for.

The total Property of the Society remains invested to yield Interest free of Income-tax at the rate of £4 6s. 8d. per cent. This rate is slightly higher than that of the previous Year.

With a view to the interests of the Shareholders, the Directors desire again to impress upon them the necessity of continued exertion and co-operation with themselves in extending the Business of the Society.

Trustees.

The Right Hon. the LORD CHANCELLOR.

The Right Hon. Lord CAIRNS.

The Right Hon. Sir W. DOVILL, Lord Chief Justice, C.P.

The Right Hon. Sir EDWARD VAUGHAN WILLIAMS.

The Hon. Sir GEORGE ROSE.

THOMAS WEBB GREENE, Esq., Q.C.

JOHN OSBORNE, Esq., Q.C.

EDWARD SMITH BIGG, Esq.

ROBERT BAYLY FOLLETT, Esq., Taxing Master in Chancery.

Directors.

BACON, JAMES, Esq., Q.C., Chief Judge in Bankruptcy.

BEAUMONT, JAMES, Esq.

BIGG, EDWARD SMITH, Esq.

BOLTON, JOHN HENRY, Esq.

BRODERIP, FRANCIS, Esq.

CHICHESTER, J. H. R., Esq.

COOKSON, W. STRICKLAND, Esq.

DART, JOSEPH HENRY, Esq.

DUGMORE, WILLIAM, Esq., Q.C.

FOLLETT, ROBERT BAYLY, Esq., Taxing Master in Chancery.

FRERE, BARTLE J. LAURIE, Esq.

GIFFARD, the Right Hon. Sir GEORGE M., Lord Justice.

GREENE, T. WEBB, Esq., Q.C.

KENDALL, JOHN, Esq.

LAMB, GEORGE, Esq.

LEMAN, JAMES, Esq.

OSBORNE, JOHN, Esq., Q.C.

PEMBERTON, E. LEIGH, Esq.

RIDEELL, Sir W. BUCHANAN, Bart.

ROSE, the Hon. Sir GEORGE.

SCADDING, EDWIN WARD, Esq.

SMITH, the Hon. Mr. Justice MONTAGUE.

SMITH, MICHAEL, Esq.

TILSON, Sir THOMAS.

Solicitors.

Messrs. DOMVILLE, LAWRENCE, & GRAHAM.

Actuary and Manager.

EDWARD ALGERNON NEWTON, Esq., M.A.

FINANCIAL POSITION ON JANUARY 1, 1870.

ANNUAL INCOME	£210,000
---------------	----------

INVESTED FUNDS	£1,583,000
----------------	------------

EXISTING ASSURANCES	£4,200,000
---------------------	------------

REVERSIONARY BONUS THEREON	£540,000
----------------------------	----------

ASSURANCE CLAIMS AND BONUS PAID	£1,780,000
---------------------------------	------------

SHARE CAPITAL, FULLY SUBSCRIBED	£1,000,000
---------------------------------	------------

(PAID UP) £160,000.)

Annual Accounts have always been published in full Detail.

SECURITY.—The Assurance Fund amounts to no less than Seven times the total Annual Income. The further Guarantee of a fully subscribed Capital of £1,000,000.

WHOLE WORLD Policies granted for a single extra Payment of 10s. per £100, where no special liability to Foreign Residence then exists. Policies on Lives of full age when assured, after Five Years' existence, without incurring extra Charge for Foreign Licence, allow unrestricted Residence in any part of the World.

NINE-TENTHS of the total Profits divisible every Five Years amongst the Assured. Very moderate Non-Bonus Premiums.

THE GENERAL CONDITIONS of Assurance printed thereon are specially framed to secure to Policies of the Society, when once issued, absolute freedom from all liability to future question.

LOANS are granted on Life Interests or Reversions.

E. A. NEWTON, Actuary and Manager.

ROYAL EXCHANGE ASSURANCE CORPORATION.

(Established A.D. 1720, by Charter of King George I., and confirmed by Special Acts of Parliament.)

CHIEF OFFICE—ROYAL EXCHANGE, LONDON; BRANCH—29 PALL MALL.

OCTAVIUS WIGRAM, Esq., Governor.

JAMES STEWART HODGSON, Esq., Sub-Governor.

CHARLES JOHN MANNING, Esq., Deputy-Governor.

Directors.

Robert Barclay, Esq.
John Garratt Cattle, Esq.
Mark Currie Close, Esq.
Edward James Daniell, Esq.
William Davidson, Esq.
Lancelot William Dent, Esq.
Alexander Druce, Esq.
Frederick Joseph Edman, Esq.
Charles Herman Gieschen, Esq.
Riversdale Wm. Grenfell, Esq.
Francis Alex. Hamilton, Esq.
Robert Amadeus Heath, Esq.

William Tetlow Hibbert, Esq.
Wilmot Holland, Esq.
Egerton Hubbard, Esq.
Neville Lubbock, Esq.
George Forbes Malcolmson, Esq.
Lord Joceline Wm. Percy.
Charles Robinson, Esq.
Samuel Leo Schuster, Esq.
Eric Carrington Smith, Esq.
Joseph Somers, Esq.
William Wallace, Esq.
Charles Baring Young, Esq.

Medical Referee—SAMUEL SOLLY, Esq., F.R.S.

FIRE, LIFE, and MARINE ASSURANCES on liberal terms.
FIRE DUTY.—This Tax having been abolished, the PREMIUM is NOW the only charge for FIRE INSURANCES.
Life Assurances with, or without, participation in Profits.
Divisions of Profit every Five Years.
Any sum up to £15,000 insurable on the same Life.
The Corporation bear the cost of Policy Stamps and Medical Fees.
A liberal participation in Profits, with the guarantee of a large invested Capital Stock, and exemption, under Royal Charter, from the liabilities of Partnership.
The advantages of modern practice, with the security of an Office whose resources have been tested by the experience of a Century and a Half.
A Prospectus and Table of Bonus will be forwarded on application.

ROBERT P. STEELE, Secretary.

HALF A MILLION has been PAID by the RAILWAY PASSENGERS' ASSURANCE COMPANY as Compensation for Accidents of All Kinds. An Annual payment of £5 to £5 5s. insures £1,000 at Death, and an Allowance at the rate of 40 per Week for Injury.
Offices—41 Cornhill; and 10 Regent Street.

WILLIAM J. VIAN, Secretary.

DIVIDENDS 5 and 10 to 20 PER CENT.

For Safe and Profitable Investments

Read SHARP'S INVESTMENT CIRCULAR (post free).

CAPITALISTS, SHAREHOLDERS, INVESTORS, TRUSTEES, will find the above Investment Circular a safe, valuable, and reliable Guide.
Messrs. SHARP & CO., Stock and Share Brokers, 33 Poultry, London, E.C. (Established 1852.)

ALLSOPP'S PALE and BURTON ALES.—These ALES are now being supplied in the finest condition, in Bottles and in Casks, by FINDLATER, MACKIE, & CO., 33 Wellington Street, Strand, W.C.

SHERRIES.—T. O. LAZENBY, 90, 92 Wigmore Street, London, W., Wine Merchant.

No. 1.—Good Ordinary Sherry	(Dry or rich)	21s.
" 3.—Sound Dinner Sherry	(Dry or rich)	30s.
" 5.—Fine Dessert Sherry	(Dry or rich)	42s.

E. LAZENBY & SON'S PICKLES, SAUCES, and CONDIMENTS.—E. LAZENBY & SON, Sole Proprietors of the celebrated Receipts, and Manufacturers of the Pickles, Sauces, and Condiments, so long and favourably distinguished by their Name, are compelled to CAUTION the Public against the inferior Preparations which are put up and labelled in close imitation of their Goods, with a view to mislead the Public.—50 Wigmore Street, Cavendish Square (late 6 Edwards Street, Portman Square), and 18 Trinity Street, London, S.E.

HARVEY'S SAUCE.—Caution.—The Admirers of this celebrated Sauce are particularly requested to observe that each Bottle, prepared by E. LAZENBY & SON, bears the Label used so many years, signed "Elizabeth Lazenby."

SAUCE—LEA & PERRINS. The "WORCESTERSHIRE," pronounced by Connoisseurs "The only Good Sauce," improves the Appetite, and aids Digestion. Unrivalled for Piquancy and Flavour. Ask for "LEA & PERRINS' SAUCE." Beware of Imitations, and see the Names of LEA & PERRINS on all Bottles and Labels. Agents, GROSSE & BLACKWELL, London, and Sold by all Dealers in Sauces throughout the World.

LIEBIG COMPANY'S EXTRACT OF MEAT.

AMSTERDAM EXHIBITION, 1869, FIRST PRIZE; being above the Gold Medal. Supplied to the British, French, Prussian, Russian, Italian, Dutch, and other Governments. One Pint of fine flavoured BEEF-TEA at 24d. Most convenient and economic "Stock."
"CAUTION.—Only sort warranted genuine by the Inventor, Baron LIEBIG, whose Signature is on every genuine Jar.
Ask for "Liebig Company's Extract," and not for Liebig's Extract of Meat.

BREAKFAST.—EPPS'S COCOA.—Grateful and Comforting. The Civil Service Gazette remarks:—"By a thorough knowledge of the natural laws which govern the operations of digestion and nutrition, and by a careful application of the fine properties of well-selected Cocoa, Mr. Epps has provided our breakfast tables with a deliciously flavoured beverage which may save us many heavy doctors' bills." Made simply with boiling water or milk. Sold in Packets, labelled—J. EPPS & CO., Homoeopathic Chemists, London.

DIGESTIVE PANCREATIC COCOA.—Specially prepared for Sufferers from Indigestion, Debility, and Pulmonary Complaints; is highly nutritious, easily digested and palatable, and adapted for the most delicate Stomach.
Sold in Tins, from 1s. 6d., by all Chemists and Italian Warehousemen, and by the Manufacturers,
SAVORY & MOORE, 119 New Bond Street, London, W.

WEAKNESS.—The finest TONIC is WATERS' QUININE WINE, unrivalled as a Stomachic Stimulant. Sold by Grocers, Oilmen, Confectioners, &c., at 30s. per Dozen.
WATERS & WILLIAMS, the Original Makers, Worcester House, 34 Eastcheap, E.C.
LEWIS & CO., Agents, Worcester.

INDIGESTION.—The MEDICAL PROFESSION adopt MORSON'S PREPARATION OF PEPSINE as the True Remedy. Sold in Bottles and Boxes from 2s. by all Pharmaceutical Chemists, and the Manufacturers, THOMAS MORSON & SON, 124 Southampton Row, Russell Square, London.

INHERITED WEAKNESS and DEBILITY.—This Subject is popularly treated in HYPOGASTRIA, a new Work by Mr. HARRY LOMB, M.R.C.S.E., &c., Surgeon Electrician. Post free, 2s. 6d. Contents—Weakness, Stammering, Spinal Debility, and Irritation, Loss of Tone, Spasmodic, Nervous Exhaustion, &c.—To be obtained at 31 Sackville Street, Piccadilly, W.

HUNT'S APERIENT FAMILY PILLS.

Prepared by qualified MEDICAL MEN, and so extensively used for more than SIXTY YEARS, that thousands may be appealed to for their Medical efficacy.

These Pills should be taken in all cases of disordered health, and as they contain no Mercury whatever, they in no way interfere with ordinary Habits and Avocations, and their operation is followed by an accession of Tone and Vigour throughout the System.

Ladies find them very beneficial both before and after Confinement.
Prepared by Messrs. HUNT, Bath, and sold by all Chemists at 1s. 11d. a Box, and 2s. 9d., which contains Three Boxes.

DINNEFORD'S PURE FLUID MAGNESIA, the best Remedy for Acidity of the Stomach, Heartburn, Headache, Gout, and Indigestion.
At 172 New Bond Street, London; and of all Chemists.

BOOKS, &c.

THE UNITED LIBRARIES, 307 Regent Street, W.

Subscriptions from One Guinea to any amount, according to the supply required. All the best New Books, English, French, and German, immediately on publication. Prospectuses, with Lists of New Publications, gratis and post free.
*A Clearance Catalogue of Surplus Books offered for Sale at greatly Reduced Prices may also be had free on application.

BOOTH'S, CHURTON'S, HODGSON'S, and SAUNDERS & OTLEY'S United Libraries, 307 Regent Street, near the Polytechnic.

MUDIE'S SELECT LIBRARY.—NEW BOOKS.—NOTICE.

Nearly all the newly published Books advertised in this day's "Saturday Review" are in Circulation at MUDIE'S SELECT LIBRARY. Fresh Copies are added as the demand increases, and an ample supply is provided of all the Principal Forthcoming Books as they appear. First-class Subscription, One Guinea per Annum, commencing at any date. Book Societies supplied on Liberal Terms. Prospectuses, postage free, on application.

MUDIE'S SELECT LIBRARY.—CHEAP BOOKS.—See

MUDIE'S CATALOGUE for MARCH, New Edition now ready, postage free on application. The Collection of Books on Sale includes more than Two Hundred Thousand Volumes of Surplus Copies of popular Books of the Past and Present Season, and Twenty Thousand Volumes of Standard Works, in ornamental bindings, well adapted for Wedding and Birthday Presents and Prizes.

MUDIE'S SELECT LIBRARY.—All the NEW BOOKS

in Circulation or on Sale at MUDIE'S SELECT LIBRARY may also be obtained with the least possible delay by all Subscribers to MUDIE'S MANCHESTER LIBRARY, Cross Street, Manchester, and (by order) from all Booksellers in connexion with the Library.
Mudie's Select Library, New Oxford Street, London; City Office, 4 King Street, Chancery.

ATLASES, MAPS, GLOBES.—Free on Application, or by

Post for One Stamp, a NEW CATALOGUE of ATLASES, MAPS, and GLOBES Published or Sold by EDWARD STANFORD, Wholesale and Retail Map-seller, 6 and 7 Chancery Cross, London, S.W., comprising Atlases of Ancient and Modern Geography; Physical, Historical, Anatomical, Historical, and Educational Atlases; Maps of the World, Europe, Asia, Africa, America, Great Britain, India, Canada, and the Colonies; London and its Environs; a New Series of School Maps; Relief Maps; the Useful Knowledge Society's Series; also Catalogues from the Geological and Ordnance Survey Maps.

London: EDWARD STANFORD, 6 and 7 Chancery Cross, S.W. Agent by Appointment for the Ordnance and Geological Survey Maps, and the Admiralty Charts.

CLARIBEL'S POPULAR SONGS. All 4s. each.

HALF-MAST HIGH.
ROBIN REDBREAST.
CHILDREN'S VOICES.
WHAT NEED HAVE I THE TRUTH TO TELL?
THE LOVE TEST.
KATHLEEN'S ANSWER.
ROSES AND DAISIES.
WED BETTER BIDE A WEE.
WEEP NO MORE, DARLING.
ALL ALONG THE VALLEY.
STRANGERS YET.
COME BACK TO ERIN.
MARION'S SONG.
FIVE O'CLOCK IN THE MORN-
ING.
WON'T YOU TELL ME WHY,
ROBIN?
LITTLE BIRD ON THE GREEN
TREE.

JANET'S BRIDAL.
THE BLUE RIBBON.
MILLY'S FAITH.
MAGGIE'S SECRET.
MAGGIE'S WELCOME.
MY BRILLIANT AND L.
JANET'S CHOICE.
SECRETS.
SILVER CHIMES.
ONLY A LOCK OF HAIR.
TAKE BACK THE HEART.
SUSAN'S STORY.
YOU AND I.
DREAMLAND.
BLIND ALICE.
THE TWO NESTS.
THE BROKEN SINCERITY.
I CANNOT SING THE OLD SONGS.

SACRED SONGS. All 2s. each.

IS THIS ALL?
THE DAY OF REST.
SHEPHERD OF ISRAEL.

BOOSEY & Co., Holles Street, London.

1870 EDITIONS.—DEBRETTS' ILLUSTRATED

PEERAGE and other Genealogical Works for 1870 contain, in consequence of the great number of Changes, new Creations, new Ministerial Appointments, new Bishops, new Members of Parliament, more New Matter than they have or are likely to have for many Years.—Price, DEBRETTS' ILLUSTRATED PEERAGE, cloth gilt, 5s. 6d., half-bound, 4s. 6d.; DEBRETTS' ILLUSTRATED BARONETAGE, with the KNIGHTAGE, cloth gilt, 5s. 6d., half-bound, 4s. 6d.; or the two Works in One Volume, half-bound, leather, 10s. 6d.; DEBRETTS' ILLUSTRATED HOUSE OF COMMONS and JUDICIAL BENCH, 6s. 6d., half-bound, best calf, 10s. 6d.

Now ready, New Edition for 1870, with all the new Knights.

DOD'S PEERAGE, BARONETAGE, KNIGHTAGE, &c. for 1870 (Thirtieth Year), containing all the new Peers, Baronets, Knights, Knights of the Bath, Bishops, Privy Counsellors, &c., corrected throughout on the highest authority.
WHITTAKER & Co., Ave Maria Lane, And all Booksellers.

THE ELEMENTS OF SOCIAL SCIENCE. By A GRADUATE

OF MEDICINE. Also a French Translation.
"No one can fail to consider it as one of the most remarkable works of the day on the subject of which it treats."—Medical Press and Circular.
THRELKEL, 25 High Holborn.

FLAGELLATION and the FLAGELLANTS: a History of

the Rod in all Ages and Countries. By the Rev. Wm. COOPER, B.A.
*A very curious Book upon a hitherto neglected chapter of our Social Annals. The Work is adorned with numerous characteristic Engravings, and the Author assures the reader that his EPP has been to the best of his ability a true History of the Rod as an instrument for Correctional purposes in the Church, the State, and the Family.
London: JOHN CAMDEN HOTTON, 74 and 75 Piccadilly.

HELLENICA SACRA: Scripture as divested of Jewish

Incarnation. By ALEXANDER VANCE.
The Introduction to the above can be had separately, price 6d.
MOFFAT & Co., London and Dublin.

VOX CLAMANTIS; or, the Fore, the After Runner. By

ALEXANDER VANCE.
MOFFAT & Co., London and Dublin.

NEW WORK ON SHEEP-FARMING.

Next week, pp. 8vo, 5s.
BRITISH SHEEP-FARMING. By WILLIAM BROWN, late of Invercauld. With numerous Tables, and Two Maps showing the Characteristics and Distribution of Sheep in Great Britain.
Edinburgh: ADAM & CHARLES BLACK.

ERNEST GEORGE'S SKETCHES, GERMAN and SWISS:

being actual Transfers, by Cowell's Anastatic Process, of the Original Pen-and-Ink Drawings of 45 picturesque Views in Nuremberg, Cologne, Würzburg, Coblenz, Prague, Bielefeld, Lucerne, Bern, Lausanne, &c. &c. With short Descriptive Text by the ARTIST.
London: W. M. THOMPSON, 48 Pall Mall, and 20 Cockspur Street.

LÜBKE'S NEW WORK ON ART.

Just published, with 184 Illustrations, price One Guinea.
ECCLESIASTICAL ART IN GERMANY DURING THE MIDDLE AGES. By Dr. WILHELM LÜBKE, Author of "The History of Art."
Edinburgh: THOMAS C. JACK. London: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, & Co.

BEN RHYDDING and the TREATMENT of CHRONIC

DISEASES. By WILLIAM MACLEOD, M.D., F.R.C.P. Edin., Senior Physician to Ben Rhydding, Consulting Physician to the Ilkley Hospital.
London: R. HARDWICKE, 192 Piccadilly.

TOMLINSON'S HANDY GUIDE-BOOK TO BEN RHYD-

DING, BOLTON ABBEY, and the NEIGHBOURHOOD.
London: R. HARDWICKE, 192 Piccadilly.

REVELATIONS OF QUACKS and QUACKERY. By

DETECTORS. Reprinted from the "Medical Circular."
London: H. BAILLIÈRE, 219 Regent Street.

EPILEPSY and its CURE. By GEO. BEAMAN, M.D., F.R.C.S.

London: RENSCHAW, 356 Strand. And all Booksellers.

A SECOND EDITION of "FRASER'S MAGAZINE" for MARCH, being No. III. of the New Series edited by J. A. FROUDE, M.A., and containing Professor TYNDALL'S Lecture on "Dust and Disease," revised by the Author, is now ready.

London: LONGMANS and Co. Paternoster Row.

Unstamped, 6d.; Stamped, 7d.
THE GRAPHIC for Saturday, March 12, will contain the following Engravings by the most eminent Artists:

The late Bishop of Chichester.
Pic-nic in Australia.
Pastoral Staff.
The Lord Chancellor.
Kimbolton Castle.
Graphic America.
Moonlight, after C. Stanfield, R.A.

Sheep in Winter-time.
Carnival in Spain.
The Harvey Torpedo Trial.
Mrs. J. Wood as Pocahontas.
Scene from the "Heir at Law," Strand Theatre.

GRAPHIC AMERICA will now appear Weekly.

THE GRAPHIC is also published in Parts containing Five Numbers.

Part III. now ready, price 2s. 6d.

THE GRAPHIC PORTFOLIO, for holding loose Numbers, price 2s. 6d., can be obtained at the Office, 190 Strand.

Every Saturday, 6d.; Stamped, 7d.

THE PALL MALL BUDGET.
CONTENTS OF No. LXXVI., MARCH 12, 1870:

LEADING ARTICLES.

The Debate on the Land Bill.
The New Zealand Debate in the Lords.
American Annexation.
Roman Catholicism and Voluntarism.
The Credit of the United States.

Mr. Deutsch on the Moabit Stone.
Court Announcements.
Church and State in America.
Public Prosecutors.
The Pope's Decree against Fenians.
A Parsonometer.

CORRESPONDENCE.

The New Forest.

REVIEWS.

British Ironclads.
"Travels in Little-known Parts of Asia Minor."
Mrs. Hawthorne's "Notes on England and Italy."
"Annals of an Eventful Life."
New Books and New Editions.

MISCELLANEOUS ARTICLES.

The Irish Land Bill.
Army Reform.
The Manslaughter of Lunatics.
Agricultural Wages and Earnings.
Progress of the Irish Church Convention.
The Wages of Irish Farm Labourers.
Lent.
India.
France.
The Revision of the Bible.

OCCASIONAL NOTES.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW.

SUMMARY OF NEWS.
Office, 2 Northumberland Street, Charing Cross.

Second Edition, now ready, Part I., 2s. 6d.

"THE FIELD" QUARTERLY MAGAZINE and REVIEW, which contains Reviews of the past Racing, Hunting, Shooting, Rowing, Football, Athletics, Croquet, and Coursing; Farm, Natural History, Garden, Shooting, Fishing, Dogs, Game Laws, &c. &c.

London: HORACE COX, 346 Strand.

THE PRACTICAL IDEALIST for MARCH—price 6d.—the Organ of the Social Progress Association, contains, with other matters, "A Patched Society" (continued).—The Scheme of the Practical and Possible Socialism.—Of the Christian Hypothesis.—An Answer to Mr. Seebohm.

The Council of the Social Progress Association invite all Social Reformers and earnest intellects to join in completing its Organisation, which now extends to America and the Antipodes. Readers of the "Saturday Review" are urged to satisfy themselves whether the aims of this movement demand their aid, if they would anticipate and hasten the future of the World's Progress. A Prospectus on application, by letter, to the Secretary, 4 Ave Maria Lane.

E. MARLBOROUGH & Co., 4 Ave Maria Lane.

THE PLAIN SPEAKER and QUEEN'S MESSENGER, Published every Thursday. Subscription, One Guinea for the Parliamentary Session. Single Numbers, post paid, 1s.

ALFRED RICHARDSON, 36 Northumberland Street, Strand.

CHURCH for NORWEGIAN SAILORS.—THE BUILDER of this Week contains View of Proposed Norwegian Church at the Docks.—Portrait of Mr. Beresford Hope, M.P.—New Curved Bench Ends, Hatfield House.—Memorials of Temple Bar.—Mr. Scott's Lectures on Architecture; and various other Papers. 4d.; or by post, 5d.

1 York Street, Covent Garden, W.C. And all Newsagents.

This day is published, small 4to, bound in gilt cloth, 7s. 6d.

MY THOUGHTS: Poems. By DOROTHEA MARIA OGLIVY of Clova.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD & SONS, London. D. WYLLIE & SON, Aberdeen.

This day is published, post 8vo. with Portraits, 7s. 6d.

BIOGRAPHIES of JOHN WILKES and WILLIAM COBBETT. By JOHN SELBY WATSON, M.A., &c.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD & SONS, Edinburgh and London.

CHEAP EDITION.

This day is published, New Edition, cloth, 3s. 6d.

GOETHE'S FAUST. Translated into English Verse. By THEODORE MARTIN.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD & SONS, Edinburgh and London.

This day, cloth neat, 3s. 6d.; by post, 3s. 10d.

THE ESTABLISHMENT; or, the Church in Danger. A Satire by AN ARCH DEACON.

"We recommend those who have the welfare of the Church at heart to read this rhymed satire, in which they will find both reason and right."—Public Opinion, February 26.

London: JOHN CAMDEN HOTTON, 74 and 75 Piccadilly.

Now ready, with coloured Plates, 7s. 6d.

THE HENWIFE'S LATER EXPERIENCE in HER OWN POULTRY YARD, in the Eighth Edition of "The Henwife." By the Hon. Mrs. ARDRETHOTT.

Edinburgh: THOMAS C. JACK. London: SIMPKIN & Co.

DEDICATED TO THE COWLEY FATHERS.

Now ready, 8vo, 7s. 6d.; by post, 8s.

SERMONS at the LONDON (1869) MISSION, at St. Paul's, Knightsbridge. By Rev. W. J. E. BENNETT, Froome School.

J. T. HAYES, 13a, 14, Eaton Square; and SIMPKIN.

Just ready, cloth, 8s. 6d.

THE GRAMMAR of ASSENT. By JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, D.D.

London: BURNS, OATES, & Co., 17 Portman Street, W., and 63 Paternoster Row, E.C.

PUBLISHED UNDER THE SANCTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF SCIENCE AND ART.

PHYSIOLOGICAL DIAGRAMMS. By Professor MARSHALL, F.R.S., F.R.C.S. Nine Sheets, Life Size, Coloured, 12s. 6d. each; or on Canvas, Rollers and Varished, each 21s.

Just published, by the same Author, Second Edition, 2 vols. royal 4to, cloth, 21s.

A DESCRIPTION of the HUMAN BODY: its Structure and Functions. Illustrated by Nine Physiological Diagrams, containing 113 Coloured Figures, reduced from the large Work, designed for the use of Schools and Young Men destined for the Medical Profession, and for popular instruction generally.

BOTANICAL DIAGRAMMS. By Professor HENSLOW. Complete on Nine Sheets of Paper, measuring 3 feet 9 inches by 2 feet 7 inches; the whole highly Coloured after the Original Drawings. Price of the Set, £2; or, mounted on Canvas with Rollers and Varished, £3.

London: ALFRED TARRANT, 11 Serle Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields.

PROFESSOR OWEN'S WORK ON VERTEBRATE ANIMALS.

Complete in 3 vols. 8vo. with 1,472 Woodcuts, price £3 13s. 6d. cloth,

THE COMPARATIVE ANATOMY and PHYSIOLOGY of the VERTEBRATE ANIMALS. By RICHARD OWEN, F.R.S. D.C.L. &c. Superintendent of the Natural History Departments, British Museum.

"To every naturalist it will prove indispensable, and the vast accumulation of facts it contains will render it a useful book even to those whose occupations are less directly connected with Anatomy and Physiology."

THE LANCET.

VOL. I. Fishes and Reptiles, with 452 Woodcuts, price 21s.

VOL. II. Warm-blooded Vertebrates, with 406 Woodcuts, 21s.

VOL. III. Mammalia, including Man, with copious Indexes to the whole Work, and 614 Woodcuts, price 31s. 6d. cloth.

London: LONGMANS, GREEN, and Co. Paternoster Row.

In 8vo. pp. 588, price 16s. cloth,

TIME and SPACE: a Metaphysical Essay. By SHADWORTH H. HODGSON.

This Work propounds a theory which covers the whole ground of Speculative Philosophy. It solves the contradictions supposed by Sir W. HAMILTON inherent in the idea of the Infinite.

PART I. contains an Analysis of Perception, and Association of Ideas.

PART II. contains the Laws of Logic, with a Criticism on HEGEL.

London: LONGMANS, GREEN, and Co. Paternoster Row.

Just published, in Two Volumes, post 8vo. price 21s.

THROUGH the NIGHT; a Tale of the Times: To which is added, ONWARD; or, a Summer Sketch. By WALTER SWEETMAN, B.A.

"Turning, however, to the stories, we admit that Mr. Sweetman writes pleasant English, and has a genial appreciation of the facts of life."—Athenaeum.

"The same desire to instruct and convert is boldly avowed in Mr. Sweetman's two tales, but it is conjoined with the power to tell a story well and briskly."—Guardian.

"The story of 'Through the Night' is in the main subservient to the purpose, religious and social, of the book; but there is yet plenty of it, and it is so wrought as never to flag even when the characters are in a state of discussion."—Morning Post.

"In these two volumes Mr. Walter Sweetman essays to prove, first, that the Roman Catholic Church can show that the balance of probability is in favour of her claim to be the divinely appointed guardian of revealed truth, and, secondly, that her own inspired teaching should make us all good Liberals."—John Bull.

London: LONGMANS, GREEN, and Co. Paternoster Row.

Just published, in crown 8vo. price 5s. cloth,

A REFERENCE-BOOK of MODERN GEOGRAPHY for the use of Public Schools and Civil Service Candidates. By A. C. EWALD, F.S.A. Foreign Correspondent of the Society of Antiquaries of Normandy; Author of "The Civil Service Guide," &c.

"An admirable work, well adapted to its professed purpose, and possessing many advantages over similar volumes, which teachers and scholars will on trial speedily discover."—Civil Service Gazette.

London: LONGMANS, GREEN, and Co. Paternoster Row.

In post 8vo. with Two Maps, price 5s. 6d. cloth,

FAMILIES of SPEECH, Four Lectures delivered at the Royal Institution of Great Britain in March 1869. By the Rev. F. W. FARHAR, M.A. F.R.S. late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; Author of "Chapters on Language," &c.

"A series of lectures at once interesting in delivery and also useful and trustworthy as a book of reference for students who wish to know the relationship of the different languages of the world."—Athenaeum.

London: LONGMANS, GREEN, and Co. Paternoster Row.

THE MARVELS of the UNIVERSE.

Just published, 1 handsome vol. large 8vo. elegantly bound in cloth, gilt top, 31s. 6d.

THE UNIVERSE; or, the Infinitely Great and the Infinitely Little. By F. A. POUCHET, M.D. Illustrated by 343 Engravings on Wood, of which 73 are Full-page size, and 4 coloured Plates.

"We can honestly commend this work, which is as admirably as it is copiously illustrated."—Times.

"Master of a literary style such as very few scientific men possess, M. Pouchet has written one of the most attractive and graphic chronicles of Nature's operations which we have ever had the fortune to meet with."—Scientific Opinion.

"We have no doubt it will find what it deserves, a popularity among English readers."—Saturday Review.

LONDON: BLACKIE & SON, 41 PATERNOSTER ROW.

This day is published, crown 8vo. extra cloth, 5s.

AIDS to CONTENTMENT. Selected by JOHN MORRIS, Editor of "The Book of Consolation."

Cambridge: DEIGHTON, BELL, & Co. London: BELL & DALBY.

This day is published, Second Edition, enlarged, xii., 254 pp. 6s.

CHOICE and CHANCE. By the Rev. WILLIAM ALLEN WHITWORTH, M.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

Cambridge: DEIGHTON, BELL, & Co. London: BELL & DALBY.

This day is published, 12s.

AUTOBIOGRAPHIC RECOLLECTIONS of GEORGE FRYME, Esq., M.A., sometime Fellow of Trinity College, Professor of Political Economy in the University of Cambridge, and M.P. for the Borough. Edited by his DAUGHTER.

Cambridge: DEIGHTON, BELL, & Co. London: BELL & DALBY.

New Edition, royal 18mo. cloth, 3s. 6d.

BLUNT'S (I. J.) SKETCH of the REFORMATION in ENGLAND. Illustrated with Full-page Engravings.

London: WILLIAM TEGG, Pancras Lane, Chapside, E.C.

ROBINSON'S GREEK LEXICON.

New Edition, 8vo. cloth, 8s. 6d.

A GREEK and ENGLISH LEXICON of the NEW TESTAMENT. By EDWARD ROBINSON, D.D.

London: WILLIAM TEGG, Pancras Lane, Chapside, E.C.

BURTON'S ANATOMY of MELANCHOLY.

8vo. cloth, with Frontispiece and Title, 8s. 6d.

THE ANATOMY of MELANCHOLY, what it is; with all its Kinds, Causes, Symptoms, Prognostics, and several Cures of it, with a Satirical Preface. A New Edition, corrected and enriched by Translations of the numerous Classical Extracts.

London: WILLIAM TEGG, Pancras Lane, Queen Street, Chapside, E.C.

Crown 8vo. cloth, 7s. 6d.

BREWSTER'S (SIR DAVID) LETTERS on NATURAL MAGIC. With Introductory Chapters on the Being and Faculties of Man, and the latest additional Phenomena of Natural Magic. By J. A. SMITH, Author of a Treatise on the Structure of Matter, &c. &c.

London: WILLIAM TEGG, Pancras Lane, Chapside.

Now ready, pp. 320, royal 8vo. cloth, 2s.

THE PRACTICE of the COURT of REFEREES on PRIVATE BILLS in PARLIAMENT, with Reports of Cases as to the Locus Standi of Petitioners during the Sessions 1867-8-9. By FREDERICK CLIFFORD, of the Middle Temple, and FREDERICK S. STEPHENS, of Lincoln's Inn, Barristers-at-Law.

All the Reports have, by permission, been verified and extended from the Official Reports prepared by the Short-hand Writer of the Court.

London: BUTTERWORTHS, 7 Fleet Street.

Ready this day, No. XXXII., price 1s.
TINSLEYS' MAGAZINE

FOR MARCH.

AN ILLUSTRATED MONTHLY.

CONTENTS:

GEORGE CANTERBURY'S WILL. By the Author of "East Lynne," &c. With an Illustration. | AUSTIN PRIARS. By the Author of "George Geith of Fen Court," With an Illustration.

THE GAMING TABLE, its Votaries and Victims, in all Countries and Times; especially in England and France. By ANDREW STEINMETZ, Barrister-at-Law. 2 vols. 8vo. [Ready this day.]

THE BATTLE-FIELDS of PARAGUAY. By Captain RICHARD F. BURTON, Author of "A Mission to Dahomé," &c. 8vo. with Map and Illustrations. [Ready this day.]

MEMOIRS of SIR GEORGE SINCLAIR, BART., of ULBSTER. By JAMES GRANT, Author of "The Great Metropolis," "The Religious Tendencies of the Times," &c. 1 vol. 8vo. with Steel Portrait. [Ready this day.]

MEMORIES of MY TIME; being Personal Reminiscences of Eminent Men. By GEORGE HODDER, Author of "Sketches of Life and Character." 8vo. [Just ready.]

THE RELIGIOUS LIFE of LONDON. By J. EWING RITCHIE, Author of "The Night Side of London," &c. 8vo. [In the press.]

NEW NOVELS IN READING AT ALL LIBRARIES.

GEORGE CANTERBURY'S WILL: a Novel. By Mrs. HENRY WOOD, Author of "East Lynne," &c. 3 vols. [Ready this day.]

GRIF: a Story of Australian Life. By B. LEOPOLD FARJEON. 2 vols.

SIDNEY BELLEW: a Sporting Story. By FRANCIS FRANCIS. 2 vols.

BENEATH the WHEELS: a Novel. By the Author of "Olive Varcoe," "Simple as a Dove," &c. 3 vols.

THE BARONET'S SUNBEAM: a Novel. 3 vols.

THE LILY and the ROSE: a Tale of the Untruth of a True Heart. By GABRIEL H. HARWOOD. 3 vols.

STRONG HANDS and STEADFAST HEARTS: a Novel. By the Countess Von BOTHMER. 3 vols.

VALENTINE FORDE: a Novel. By CECIL GRIFFITH, Author of "Victory Deane," "Maud Mainwaring," &c. 3 vols.

HEATHFIELD HALL; or, Prefatory Life. A Youthful Reminiscence. By HANS SCHREIBER.

PHEBE'S MOTHER: a Novel. By LOUISA ANNE MEREDITH, Author of "My Bush Friends in Tasmania," &c. 2 vols.

GOLD and TINSEL: a Novel. By the Author of "Ups and Downs of an Old Maid's Life." 3 vols. [Ready this day.]

VERONICA: a Novel. By the Author of "Aunt Margaret's Trouble," "Mabel's Progress," &c. (From "All the Year Round.") 3 vols. [Just ready.]

NOT WHILE SHE LIVES: a Novel. By Mrs. ALEXANDER FRASER, Author of "Faithless; or, the Loves of the Period," &c. 2 vols. [Ready this day.]

AUSTIN PRIARS: a Novel. By the Author of "George Geith," "City and Suburb," "Too Much Alone," &c. 3 vols. [On April 15.]

GWENDOLINE'S HARVEST: a Novel. By the Author of "Lost Sir Massingberd," "Found Dead," &c. 2 vols. [Just ready.]

A DOUBLE SECRET and GOLDEN PIPPIN. By JOHN POMEROY. 3 vols. [Just ready.]

STRETTON. By HENRY KINGSLEY, Author of "Ravenshoe," "Geoffrey Hamlyn," &c. New and Cheaper Edition, 1 vol. price 6s. [Ready this day.]

TWO-SHILLING EDITIONS OF POPULAR NOVELS.

To be had of all Booksellers, and at every Railway Stall in the Kingdom.

SWORD AND GOWN.
THE DOWER HOUSE.
MISS FORRESTER.
SANS MERCI.
NOT WISELY, BUT TOO WELL.
DR. BRADY.
RECOMMENDED TO MERCY.
THE SAVAGE CLUB PAPERS.
BREAKING A BUTTERFLY.

THE ROCK AHEAD.
THE PRETTY WIDOW.
BRAKESPEARE.
MAURICE DERING.
THE WATERDALE NEIGHBOURS.
BLACK SHEEP.
BARREN HONOUR.
EVERY-DAY PAPERS.

TINSLEY BROTHERS, 18 CATHERINE STREET, STRAND.

MR. DICKENS'S NEW WORK.

On March 31 will be published,

PRICE ONE SHILLING,

PART I. OF THE

MYSTERY OF EDWIN DROOD.

By CHARLES DICKENS.

WITH ILLUSTRATIONS BY S. L. FILDES.

To be completed in **TWELVE MONTHLY NUMBERS**, uniform with the Original Editions of "Pickwick" and "Copperfield."

THE ARTS of the MIDDLE AGES and of the RENAISSANCE PERIOD. By PAUL LACROIX (Bibliophile Jacob). Beautifully illustrated with 19 Chromo-Lithographic Plates and 400 Woodcuts, half morocco, 31s. 6d. [Now ready.]

THE FELLAH. By EDMOND ABOUT. Translated by Sir RANDAL ROBERTS. 1 vol. [This day.]

THE AUSTRO-HUNGARIAN EMPIRE, and the POLICY of COUNT BEUST: a Sketch of Men and Events from 1866-1870. By AN ENGLISHMAN. [Ready next week.]

RECOLLECTIONS of ETON. By AN EROSIAN. 1 vol. Illustrated by Sydney P. Hall. [Next week.]

OLIVER CROMWELL'S LETTERS and SPEECHES. Vol. II. Forming the New Volume of the Library Edition of Mr. Carlyle's Works. Demy 8vo, 9s. [March 15.]

SELECTIONS from the WRITINGS of THOMAS CARLYLE. 1 vol. crown 8vo, 6s. [This day.]

AMERICAN SOCIETY. By GEORGE MAKEPEACE TOWLE, U.S. Consul at Bradford. 2 vols. crown 8vo, 21s.

NOW-A-DAYS; or, Courts, Courtiers, Churchmen, Garibaldians, Lawyers, and Brigands at Home and Abroad. By J.B. DIOBY BESTE. 2 vols. demy 8vo, 21s.

SKETCHES of LIFE and SPORT in SOUTH-EASTERN AFRICA. By CHARLES HAMILTON, F.A.S.L. Edited by F.G.H. PRICE, F.R.G.S., F.A.S.L. Crown 8vo, illustrated, 9s.

NEW NOVELS.

1. **TOO MUCH and TOO LITTLE MONEY.** By the Author of "A Change of Luck." 3 vols.

2. **A DANGEROUS GUEST.** By the Author of "Gilbert Rugge," &c. 2 vols.

3. **NOT TO BE:** a Story of the Day. By PAUL BENISON. 2 vols.

4. **OUIDA'S NEW NOVEL—PUCK.** 3 vols.

5. **MRS. STEELE'S NEW NOVEL—SO RUNS the WORLD AWAY.** 3 vols.

6. **ANNA DRURY'S NEW NOVEL—The NORMANS;** or, Kith and Kin. 2 vols.

7. **FALLEN AMONG THIEVES:** a Novel of "Interest." By ARTHUR A'BECKETT. 3 vols.

8. **NOT IN VAIN.** By ARMAR GREYE.

CHAPMAN & HALL, 193 PICCADILLY.

Next week will be published, 2 vols. post 8vo, 21s.

JOURNAL

OF

THE WATERLOO CAMPAIGN.

Kept throughout the Campaign of 1815.

By General CAVALIÉ MERCER, Commanding the 9th Brigade Royal Artillery.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD & SONS, EDINBURGH AND LONDON.

ALBEMARLE STREET, March 1870.

MR. MURRAY'S
NEWEST PUBLICATIONS.

THE RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.
THE IRISH LAND BILL: a Correct Report
of the Speech delivered in the House of Commons on February 14, by the
Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P. 8vo. 2s.

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH.
8vo. 14s.
THE CHURCH and the AGE: a Series of
Essays on the Principles and Present Position of the Anglican Church. By
the following Writers:

Dean of CHICHESTER.
Bishop of GLOUCESTER and BRISTOL.
Rev. W. J. IRONS, D.D.
Rev. B. ST. JOHN TYRWITT.
Professor MONTAGU BURROWS.
Rev. WALSHAM HOW.

Rev. A. W. HADDAN.
Rev. M. F. SADLER.
Rev. ALFRED BARRY, D.D.
Sir BANTLE FRIERE.
Rev. W. D. MACLAGAN.
Rev. ARCHIBALD WEIR, D.C.L.

THE EARL STANHOPE.
THE REIGN of QUEEN ANNE until the
PEACE of UTRECHT. Designed as a Connecting Link between the Conclu-
sion of Lord Macaulay's History and the Commencement of Lord Mahon's.
By Earl STANHOPE (late Lord Mahon). 8vo. 16s.

THE HON. DUDLEY CAMPBELL.
COMPULSORY EDUCATION, with some
Remarks on Mr. Forster's Education Bill. By the Hon. DUDLEY CAMPBELL,
M.A. 8vo. 1s.

ALPINE FLOWERS FOR GARDENS.
ALPINE FLOWERS: an Explanation of the
Principles on which the Exquisite Flora of Alpine Countries may be grown
to Perfection in all Parts of the British Islands, with numerous Illustrations
of Rock-gardens, Natural and Artificial, and containing Descriptions of all
the finest known kinds, with full Directions for their Culture. By W.
ROBINSON, F.L.S., Author of "The Parks, Promenades, and Gardens of
Paris." Crown 8vo. with numerous Woodcuts. [Nearly ready.]

SIR CHARLES BELL, F.R.S.
A SELECTION from the FAMILIAR COR-
RESPONDENCE of the late SIR CHARLES BELL, F.R.S., Author of the
"Anatomy and Philosophy of Expression." Post 8vo. with Portrait, 12s.

THE MISSIONARY IN ASIA MINOR.
TRAVELS in ASIA MINOR. With an
Account of Missionary Labours, Observations on the State of Society, and a
Description of Antiquarian Researches and Discoveries, together with Illus-
trations of Biblical Literature and Archeology. By HENRY VAN LENNEP,
D.D., Thirty years resident in Turkey. 2 vols. post 8vo. with Map and Illus-
trations, 24s.

SIR CHARLES EASTLAKE, R.A.
A MEMOIR of the LIFE of the late SIR
CHARLES EASTLAKE, P.R.A. By Lady EASTLAKE. Together with
additional Contributions to the Literature of the Fine Arts. 8vo. 12s.

THE PLANTER'S CHOICE.
TREES and SHRUBS for ENGLISH PLAN-
TATIONS: a Selection and Description of the most Ornamental Trees and
Shrubs, Native and Foreign, which will flourish in the Open Air in our
Climate; with Classified Lists of the several Species under the heads of Soil,
Aspect, Form, Colour of Foliage, Season of Blooming, &c. &c., for the pur-
poses of Practical Application. By AUGUSTUS MONGREDIEN. 8vo. with
Illustrations. [Nearly ready.]

THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK.
LIFE in the LIGHT of GOD'S WORD. By
WILLIAM THOMSON, D.D., Lord Archbishop of York. New Edition, revised
and enlarged. Post 8vo. 5s.

DR. WM. SMITH.
A COPIOUS and CRITICAL ENGLISH-
LATIN DICTIONARY. Compiled from Original Sources. By Wm. SMITH,
LL.D., and THEOPHILUS D. HALL, M.A. Also a Smaller Edition for the Use
of Schools. Medium 8vo. 21s.; square 12mo. 7s. 6d.

REV. J. L. PORTER, LL.D.
DAMASCUS, PALMYRA, and LEBANON,
with Travels among the Cities of Bashan and the Hauran. By Rev. J. L.
PORTER. Forming the New Volume of Murray's Choice Travels. Revised
Edition, post 8vo. with Illustrations, 7s. 6d. [Next week.]

PROFESSOR MAINE.
ANCIENT LAW: its Connection with the
Early History of Society, and its Relation to Modern Ideas. By HENRY
SUMNER MAINE, Professor of Civil Law and Jurisprudence in the
University of Oxford, and formerly Reader on Jurisprudence and the Civil
Law at the Middle Temple. Fourth Edition, 8vo. 12s.

PROFESSOR VON SYBEL.
THE CONCLUDING VOLUMES of VON
SYBEL'S HISTORY of EUROPE DURING the FRENCH REVOLU-
TION. Chiefly from the Secret Archives of Austria, Prussia, and other
German States. Translated from the Third German Edition, with much new
Matter. By WALTER C. PERRY, LL.D. 2 vols. with Index, 8vo. 24s.

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

NEW WORKS.

NO APPEAL: a Novel. By the Author of
"Cut Down like Grass." 3 vols. post 8vo. price 31s. 6d.

THE LETTERS of the late RIGHT HON.
SIR GEORGE CORNEWALL LEWIS. Edited by his Brother, the Rev. Sir
G. F. LEWIS, Bart. 8vo. with Portrait. [On Thursday next.]

ENGLAND to DELHI: a Narrative of Indian
Travel. By JOHN MATHESON, Glasgow. Imperial 8vo. with very numerous
Illustrations. [Next week.]

NARRATIVE of a SPRING TOUR in
PORTUGAL. By the Rev. A. C. SMITH, M.A., Ch. Ch. Oxon. Post 8vo.
price 6s. 6d.

VARIETIES of VICE-REGAL LIFE. By
Sir WILLIAM DENISON, K.C.B., late Governor-General of the Australian
Colonies and Governor of Madras. With 2 Maps. 2 vols. 8vo. 28s.

LAND SYSTEMS and INDUSTRIAL ECO-
NOMY of IRELAND, ENGLAND, and CONTINENTAL COUNTRIES.
By T. E. CLIFFE LESLIE, LL.B., Barrister-at-Law. 8vo. [Nearly ready.]

A HISTORICAL ACCOUNT of the NEU-
TRALITY of GREAT BRITAIN during the AMERICAN CIVIL WAR.
By MOUNTAGUE BERNARD, M.A., Chichele Professor of International Law
and Diplomacy, Oxford. 1 vol. 8vo. [Nearly ready.]

HOME POLITICS; or, the Growth of Trade
considered in relation to Labour, Pauperism, and Emigration. By DANIEL
GRANT. 8vo. price 7s.

CASHMERE MISGOVERNMENT. By
ROBERT THORP. 8vo. price 1s. 6d.

UNCLE PETER'S FAIRY TALE for the
XIXth CENTURY. Edited by ELIZABETH M. SEWELL. Fcp. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

SCENES and STUDIES; or, Errant Steps
and Stray Fancies. By Captain J. W. CLAYTON, F.R.G.S., late 13th Light
Dragoons. Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

THE STOICS, EPICUREANS, and SCEP-
TICS. Translated from the German of Dr. E. ZELLER, by OSWALD J. REICHEL,
B.C.L. and M.A. Crown 8vo. price 14s.

LOGIC, DEDUCTIVE and INDUCTIVE.
By ALEXANDER BAIN, LL.B., Professor of Logic in the University of Aber-
deen. 2 vols. crown 8vo. [In April.]

A VIEW of the SCRIPTURE REVELA-
TIONS concerning a FUTURE STATE. By RICHARD WHATLEY, D.D.,
Archbishop of Dublin. Ninth Edition. Fcp. 8vo. price 5s.

JUDGED by HIS WORDS: an Attempt to
Weigh a certain kind of Evidence respecting CHRIST. 1 vol. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

FORTY-FOUR SCHOOL SERMONS
PREACHED in ST. PAUL'S CHURCH, Manchester. By ROBERT LAMB,
M.A., Rector. 2 vols. post 8vo. price 14s.

TWENTY-ONE SERMONS on Subjects more
or less interesting at the Present Time. By A. WOLFE, M.A. Rector of
Parham All Saints and of Westley, Bury St. Edmunds. Fcp. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

ANCIENT HISTORY of EGYPT, ASSY-
RIA, and BABYLONIA. By ELIZABETH M. SEWELL. Second Edition, with
Questions and Index. Fcp. 8vo. price 6s.

HUNTER'S ANNOTATED EDITION of
SHAKESPEARE'S CORIOLANUS and ANTONY and CLEOPATRA. 12mo.
price ONE SHILLING each Play.

A TREATISE on MEDICAL ELECTRICITY,
Theoretical and Practical; and its Use in the Treatment of Diseases. By
JULIUS ALTHAUS, M.D. Second Edition, enlarged; with Plate and 62 Wood-
cuts. Post 8vo. price 15s.

GRAY'S ANATOMY, Descriptive and Sur-
gical. With about 410 Woodcuts from Dissections. Fifth Edition, by T.
HOLMES, M.A. Cantab. With a New Introduction by the Editor. Royal
8vo. 28s.

THE COMPARATIVE ANATOMY and
PHYSIOLOGY of the VERTEBRATE ANIMALS. By RICHARD OWEN,
F.R.S. D.C.L. With 1,472 Woodcuts. 3 vols. 8vo. £3 13s. 6d.

London: LONGMANS, GREEN, READER, and DYER.

13 GREAT MARLBOROUGH STREET.

HURST & BLACKETT'S NEW WORKS.

A BOOK ABOUT the CLERGY. By J.

C. JEAFFRESON, B.A. Oxon. SECOND EDITION, 2 vols. 8vo. 30s.
Times.—"This is a book of sterling excellence, in which all, lay as well as clergy will find entertainment and instruction; a book to be bought and placed permanently in our libraries. It is written in a terse and lively style, and is full of interesting information on almost every topic that serves to illustrate the history of the English clergy."
Standard.—"These amusing volumes are full of pleasant, lively, and instructive information."
Full Mail Gazette.—"Honest praise may be awarded to these volumes. Mr. Jeafrason has collected a large amount of curious information and a rich store of facts."

VOL. II. of HER MAJESTY'S TOWER.

By W. HEPWORTH DIXON. DEDICATED BY EXPRESS PERMISSION TO THE QUEEN. FIFTH EDITION, 8vo. 15s.
 "Mr. Dixon dashes off the scenes of Tower history with great spirit. His descriptions are given with terseness and vigour. Both volumes are decidedly attractive."—*Times*.

LODGE'S PEERAGE and BARONETAGE

for 1870. Under the Especial Patronage of HER MAJESTY. Corrected by the Nobility, CONTAINING ALL THE NEW CREATIONS. Thirty-ninth Edition, 1 vol. with the Arms beautifully Engraved, handsomely bound, 31s. 6d.
 "A work of great value. The most faithful record we possess of the aristocracy of the day."—*Post*.

THE NEW AND POPULAR NOVELS.

A BRAVE LADY. By the Author of "John

Halifax, Gentleman." 3 vols.

HAGAR. By the Author of "St. Olave's."

"Hagar" is a book to be cherished in the reader's memory as a specimen of the purest order in the art of fiction. The story is full of strong human interest, and is rich in beautiful bits of description. It seizes upon the imagination as strongly as upon the feelings."—*Examiner*.

ANNALS of an EVENTFUL LIFE. By

GEORGE WEBBE DASENT, D.C.L. FOURTH EDITION, 3 vols.
The Times.—"This is a very interesting novel: wit, humour, and keen observation abound in every page, while the characters are lifelike. For a long while we have not met a work of fiction containing such a fund of varied entertainment."
Saturday Review.—"It is a pleasure to hear the voice of a man who possesses a fund of original ideas, and expresses them succinctly in singularly good English."
Full Mail Gazette.—"This story is excellent: a series of scenes are hit off humorously and happily, that make it extremely pleasant reading."

ONE MAIDEN ONLY. By E. CAMPBELL

TAINSH, Author of "St. Alice," "Crowned," &c. 3 vols.
 "A novel of exceptional merit. The story possesses a freshness and a noble impressiveness that broadly mark it out from its contemporaries."—*Telegraph*.
 "A very interesting and enthralling story."—*Sun*.

ST. BEDE'S. By Mrs. EILOART, Author of

"The Curate's Discipline," &c. 3 vols. [March 18.]

This day is published, 2 vols. 8vo. Illustrated by Photographs and Portraits, 28s.
MEMORIALS of the LIFE and CHARACTER of LADY OSBORNE, and some of HER FRIENDS. Edited by her Daughter, Mrs. OSBORNE. Containing numerous Unpublished Letters of Archbishop Whately, Monsieur de Sismond, and others.
 Dublin: HODGES, FOSTER, & Co., Grafton Street, Publishers to the University.
 London: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, & Co.

MR. TENNYSON'S NEW VOLUME.

Now ready, small 8vo. 7s.

THE HOLY GRAIL,

And other Poems.

By ALFRED TENNYSON, D.C.L., Poet-Laureate.

MR. TENNYSON'S OTHER WORKS.

POEMS. Small 8vo. 9s. IDYLLS OF THE KING—Collected Small 8vo. 12s.
 THE PRINCESS. Small 8vo. 5s. ENOCH ARDEN, &c. Small 8vo. 6s.
 MAUD, and other Poems. Small 8vo. 5s. SELECTIONS. Square 8vo. 5s.
 IDYLLS OF THE KING. Small 8vo. 7s. IN MEMORIAM. Small 8vo. 6s.

Now ready,

THE POCKET-VOLUME EDITION of MR. TENNYSON'S WORKS. 10 vols. in neat case, £2 5s.

LONDON: STRAHAN & CO., 56 LUDGATE HILL.

NEW WORK BY THE BISHOP OF WINCHESTER.

Now ready, post 8vo. 9s.

HEROES OF HEBREW HISTORY.

By SAMUEL WILBERFORCE, D.D.
 Bishop of Winchester.

LONDON: STRAHAN & CO., 56 LUDGATE HILL.

NEW WORK BY THE AUTHOR OF "AN ESSAY ON PANTHEISM."

Now ready, Vol. I. demy 8vo. price 16s.

RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

IN

ENGLAND,

From the Reformation to the End of Last Century.

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

By the Rev. JOHN HUNT, M.A.
 Author of "An Essay on Pantheism."

LONDON: STRAHAN & CO., 56 LUDGATE HILL.

MR. BENTLEY'S LIST.

NOW READY.

SECOND EDITION of RED AS A ROSE

IS SHE. By the Author of "Cometh Up as a Flower," &c. 3 vols. post 8vo.

THE POETRY of the PERIOD. By ALFRED

AUSTIN, Author of "The Season: a Satire." Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

LADY GEORGIANA FULLERTON'S NEW STORY OF MODERN LIFE.

MRS. GERALD'S NIECE. By Lady

GEORGIANA FULLERTON, Author of "Lady-Bird," "Too Strange Not to be True," &c. 3 vols.

THE FALL of BABYLON, as Foreshadowed

in History and in Prophecy. By the Rev. JOHN CUMMING, D.D. Crown 8vo. 6s.

CONTENTS: The Pretensions of the Papacy—Babylon the Great—The Antichrist—Infallible Ecumenical Councils—Lying Wonders—Mariolatry—The Roman Church Immoral, Intolerant, and Persecuting—The Quarrels of the Fathers—Canonical Curses, &c. &c.

MEMOIRS of ANNE-PAULE-DOMINIQUE

DE NOAILLES, MARQUISE DE MONTAGU. Crown 8vo. with Photographic Portrait, 7s. 6d.

NEARLY READY.

THE ADVENTURES of WALTER

RALEIGH SINJOHN: a Cosmopolitan Romance. By H. C. ROSS JONES, F.R.G.S., Author of "A Long Vacation in the Argentine Alps." Crown 8vo. price 10s. 6d. [On Monday next.]

SKETCHES of MODERN PARIS. From

the German. By FRANCES LOCOCK. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

A RACE for a WIFE. By HAWLEY SMART,

Author of "Breezie Langton." Crown 8vo. 10s. 6d.

RICHARD BENTLEY, NEW BURLINGTON STREET.

LORD STANHOPE'S QUEEN ANNE.

On Monday next, 8vo. price 16s.

THE REIGN of QUEEN ANNE UNTIL the

PEACE of UTRECHT. Designed as a Connecting Link between the Conclusion of Lord Macanlay's History and the Commencement of Lord Mahon's. By EARL STANHOPE (late Lord Mahon).

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

LORD LYTTON.

Now ready, Second Edition, post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

THE LOST TALES of MILETUS. By Lord LYTTON.

Also, a New Edition, post 8vo. 10s. 6d.

POEMS. By Lord LYTTON.

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

This day is published, in 1 vol. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

PICCADILLY:

A Fragment of Contemporary Biography.

By LAURENCE OLIPHANT,
 Late M.P. for the Stirling Burghs; Author of the "Russian Shores of the Black Sea," &c. &c.

CONTENTS: 1. Love—2. Madness—3. Suicide—4. The World—5. The Flesh—6. The "—Conclusion—Moral.

WITH EIGHT ILLUSTRATIONS BY RICHARD DOYLE.

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD & SONS, EDINBURGH AND LONDON.

NEW WORK BY PROFESSOR PLUMPTRE.

Now ready, post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

BIBLICAL STUDIES.

By E. H. PLUMPTRE, M.A.
 Rector of Pluckley, and Professor of Divinity, King's College, London.

LONDON: STRAHAN & CO., 56 LUDGATE HILL.

SAMPSON LOW & CO.'S NEW BOOKS.

SOCIETY and SOLITUDE. Essays by RALPH WALDO EMERSON. Forming the Eighth Volume of Low's Copyright Series of American Books. 1s. 6d.; cloth, 2s. CONTENTS: Society and Solitude—Civilization—Art—Eloquence—Domestic Life—Farming—Works and Days—Books—Clubs—Courage—Success—Old Age.

HEDGED IN. By the Author of "The Gates Ajar." 1 vol. small 8vo. 2s. 6d. Published simultaneously in London and Boston by arrangement with the Author.

THE BOTTOM of the SEA. By L. SONREL. Translated and Edited by ELIHU RICH. Post 8vo. with 67 Illustrations, cloth, 5s.

THE PHOTOGRAPHIC ART JOURNAL. Illustrated with Photographs printed in permanent Pigments. Royal 4to. and continued Monthly, 2s. 6d.

Illustrations to No. 1. (ready this day).
Painting by Jacques, "Return of the Flock," 8½ by 5½ inches.
Scene from Nature, "View near La Grande Chartreuse," 6½ by 5 inches.
Engraving by Albert Dürer, "The Nativity," 7 by 4½ inches.

LIFE and LETTERS of LEOPOLD I., KING of the BELGIANS. By THEODORE JUSTE. Translated by ROBERT BLACK, A.M. One Volume Edition, bound 2 vols. in 1, cloth extra, uniform with the "Early Days of the Prince Consort." 8vo. with 2 Portraits, 16s. [This day.]

NEW AND POPULAR NOVELS.

KILMENY. By WILLIAM BLACK, Author of "In Silk Attire." 3 vols. [This day.]

LONGLEAT. By ELLERAY LAKE. 3 vols. [This day.]

TRUE to HERSELF. By the Author of "Anne Judge, Spinster," &c. 3 vols. [Ready on March 16.]

HITHERTO. By the Author of "The Gay-worthys." 3 vols. [Ready.]

LORNA DOONE: a Story of Exmoor. 3 vols. [Ready.]

LONDON: SAMPSON LOW, SON, & MARSTON, 188 FLEET STREET.

NEW WORKS.

THE MAN WITH the IRON MASK. By MARIUS TUPIN. Translated and Edited by HENRY VIZETELLY, Author of "The Story of the Diamond Necklace." Crown 8vo. [In the press.]

RECONNOITRING in ABYSSINIA: a Narrative of the Proceedings of the Reconnoitring Party prior to the Arrival of the Main Body of the Expeditionary Field Force. By Colonel H. ST. CLAIR WILKINS, R.E., Aide-de-Camp to the Queen, Commanding Engineer Abyssinian Expeditionary Force, &c. Demy 8vo. with 10 Coloured Views from Sketches made in the Country, and a Map, 18s. [Ready.]

ROUND ABOUT PICCADILLY and PALL MALL; or, a Ramble from the Haymarket to Hyde Park: a Retrospect of the various Changes that have occurred in the Court End of London. By HENRY B. WHEATLEY. 1 vol. 8vo. with Illustrations, 16s. [Ready.]

TERENCE MCGOWAN, the IRISH TENANT. By G. L. TOTTERHAM. 2 vols. post 8vo. [Next week.]

LETTICE LISLE. By the Author of "Stone Edge." Reprinted from the "Cornhill Magazine." Crown 8vo. with 3 Illustrations, 6s. [In a few days.]

SMITH, ELDER, & CO., 15 WATERLOO PLACE.

Just published, with fine Steel Portrait of E. J. Reed, Esq., Chief Constructor of H.M. Navy, &c., cloth, 5s.

THE YEAR-BOOK of FACTS in SCIENCE and ART, 1870. By JOHN TIMBS, Author of "Curiosities of Science," &c.

"This excellent little handybook to the chief scientific discoveries of the past year fully maintains its reputation."—*Athenæum*, February 19, 1870.

* For Sets of this valuable Series, see Advertisement below.

LONDON: LOCKWOOD & CO., 7 STATIONERS' HALL COURT, E.C.

THE YEAR-BOOK of FACTS in SCIENCE and ART.

* As an inducement to new Subscribers, Sets from 1861 to 1870, with an extra Volume, 1862 (11 vols. in all), will be supplied post free for 42s. if ordered direct from the Publishers. P.O. Orders to be made payable to

LOCKWOOD & CO., 7 STATIONERS' HALL COURT, E.C.

NEW BOOKS AND NEW EDITIONS.

This day, 4to. handsomely bound, 25s.

SPECIMENS

OF THE

DRAWINGS OF TEN MASTERS

From the Royal Collection at Windsor Castle.

MICHELANGELO.
PERUGINO.
RAPHAEL.
JULIO ROMANO.
LEONARDO DA VINCI.

GIORGIONE.
PAUL VERONESE.
POUSSIN.
ALBERT DÜRER.
HOLBEIN.

With Descriptive Text by B. B. WOODWARD, F.S.A.
Librarian to the Queen.

And 20 Autotypes by Edwards and Kidd.

This day, 8vo. with Portrait, Maps, Plans, and Illustrations, 16s.

A LIFE OF THE GREAT LORD FAIRFAX,

Commander-in-Chief of the Army of the Parliament of England.

By CLEMENTS R. MARKHAM, F.S.A.

AMONG MY BOOKS. By J. R. LOWELL.

Six Essays. CONTENTS: Dryden—Witchcraft—Shakespeare once more—New England Two Centuries Ago—Lessing—Rousseau and the Sentimentalists. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. [This day.]

SECOND EDITION, revised.

ON LABOUR: its Wrongful Claims and Rightful Dues—its Actual Present and Possible Future. By W. T. THORNTON, Author of "A Plea for Peasant Proprietors." 8vo. 14s.

DARWINISM.—THE NOACHIAN FLOOD:

a Lecture delivered before the Torquay Natural History Society, January 31, 1870. By T. B. R. STEBBING, M.A. Crown 8vo. 1s. [This day.]

MACMILLAN & CO., LONDON.

CLARENDON PRESS BOOKS.

SMITH'S WEALTH of NATIONS: an Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations. By ADAM SMITH, LL.D. Edited, with Notes, by Professor ROGERS. 2 vols. 8vo. with Portrait, 21s. [This day.]

SECOND EDITION, with INDEX, this day.

A MANUAL of POLITICAL ECONOMY for COLLEGES and SCHOOLS. By Professor ROGERS. Extra fcp. 8vo. price 4s. 6d.

OXFORD: PRINTED AT THE CLARENDON PRESS, AND PUBLISHED BY MACMILLAN & CO., LONDON, PUBLISHERS TO THE UNIVERSITY.

1 vol. 8vo. cloth, 16s.

SMITH'S WEALTH OF NATIONS.

STANDARD EDITION.

Edited by J. R. McCULLOCH.

EDINBURGH: BLACK. LONDON: LONGMANS.

Now ready, 3 vols. post 8vo.

MABELDEAN, or CHRISTIANITY REVERSED: a Social, Political, and Theological Novel. By OWEN GOWER.

"The style of 'Mabeldean' is picturesque and attractive; and as a model of English writing the work is of a high order of merit. Mr. Gower has a rich vocabulary and rare powers of description. . . . The management of the book in an artistic point of view leaves little to be desired. The great peculiarity of the book is its subject matter; in this respect it is unique of its kind. . . . Altogether different from the ordinary 'sensational' novel of the day."—*Morning Post*.

"A great deal of amusement is to be got out of the book."—*Athenæum*.

"Well chosen legends on the gate of a fair domicile prepare us for the order and system of the government within."—*Daily Telegraph*.

"He occasionally wields a very powerful pen."—*Illustrated London News*.

"The only way to do justice to the author of 'Mabeldean' would be to reproduce his work uncuttailed. . . . The author excels in description, and is faithful to a fault in his studies of animated nature. . . . We can recall few things more dramatic than the scene in which he (Mr. Dean) loses the Dreary Wood Estate. . . . We have endeavoured to give some faint conception of this marvellous effort of thought and art, and we might write volumes of comment on it."—*Saturday Review*.

"The ordinary style of the book in its narrative parts is a diffuse, flowery, poetical one, to which no description will do justice. . . . Space will not permit us to indulge in further extracts from this extraordinary book, although they might easily be multiplied to an indefinite extent."—*Standard*.

"Certainly one of the most singular books it has ever been our fortune to peruse. . . . fairly takes away the reader's breath."—*Literary World*.

"The author of 'Mabeldean' is a philanthropist of a very high order."—*Church Times*.

"Shrewd as he (the author) is, well educated, acquainted with the world, and capable of true humour."—*Contemporary Review*.

"An amazing quantity of information is conveyed to us in the most forcible manner."—*Spectator*.

LONDON: LONGMANS & CO., PATERNOSTER ROW.

JOHN JOSEPH MECHE, 112 REGENT STREET, LONDON, OPPOSITE VIGO STREET.

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

JOHN JOSEPH MECHE respectfully informs his Friends, his Customers, and the Public, that, owing to the death of his late Partner, he has resumed the whole of the Business at No. 112 Regent Street, and will (assisted by his Son) conduct it in his own name, with his original spirit and vigour, the main principles being superior quality, combined with moderate prices adapted to the present times. First-class Workmen are employed in every department, so that the various fittings, Cutlery, Brushes, &c., of the Dressing Bags and Dressing Cases, shall be perfect for use and of warranted quality. Although this has become an age of beards (now, however, going out), those who still indulge in a clean shaven chin will find comfort in his celebrated Razors and Magic Strop and Paste, which have stood the test for 41 years. Mr. MECHE invites his old Friends and Customers to inspect his immense Stock, which presents an ample variety of utilities and elegances, suitable for presentation, including all the newest fashions in the various departments. While manufactures of great elegance and cost, and in great variety, are submitted for the luxurious and wealthy, Mr. MECHE wishes it to be clearly understood that articles of every-day use, at most moderate prices, are in ample supply and variety. For instance, the very best quality of Blade in a neat PENKNIFE of Buck's Horn or Ivory Handle at 1s. each; best TOOTH BRUSHES (not Ivory) at 6d. each; and other things in proportion, all warranted in quality, though cheap in price. Attention is particularly requested to a variety of splendid Exhibition Articles, which will be sold a bargain, much under cost price, to close accounts.

ILLUSTRATED CATALOGUES POST FREE.—112 REGENT STREET, LONDON.—ESTABLISHED 1827.

SHOW ROOM 55 YARDS LONG, EXTENDING INTO GLASSHOUSE STREET.

MECHE'S WEDDING PRESENTS.—DRESSING CASES AND BAGS.

MECHE'S LEADING ARTICLES.

GOOD and CHEAP.

THE TWO-GUINEA DRESSING BAG.

THE FIVE-GUINEA DRESSING BAG.

THE TEN-GUINEA DRESSING BAG.

THE TWENTY-GUINEA DRESSING BAG.

DRESSING CASES, from 17s. 6d. to £500.

ALL the NEWEST PATTERNS.

JOHN JOSEPH MECHE, 112 Regent Street.

BLOTTING BOOKS, from 4s. to £6.

BOOK SLIDES, from 10s. to £15.

BIRTHDAY GIFTS, Various and Novel.

BRUSHES of all Descriptions—Hair, Tooth, Nail, and Shaving—in Ivory, Wood, and Bone.

CRIBBAGE, CHESS, and BACK-GAMMON BOARDS.

CARD TRAYS, from 10s. 6d. to £5 5s.

CHEAP and GOOD CUTLERY.

JOHN JOSEPH MECHE, 112 Regent Street.

Excellent PENKNIVES and SCISSORS, 1s. each.

CHESS and ORNAMENTAL TABLES,

in Papier-mâché, from 4s. to £12 each.

JOHN JOSEPH MECHE, 112 Regent Street.

MULTIFORMS, HAND SCREENS, CARD TRAYS,

WORK BOXES, WRITING DESKS, and CARD BOXES,

in Papier-mâché.

CIGAR CASES, from 6s. to £0 10s.

COURIER BAGS, from 9s. to £2 10s.

CUTLERY GROUND and REPAIRED.

DESKS and DRESSING CASES REPAIRED.

DESPATCH BOXES, from 21s. to £230.

DRINKING FLASKS, from 1s. 6d. to £10.

All the latest Forms.

JOHN JOSEPH MECHE, 112 Regent Street.

ELEGANT BRONZES, at Cost Prices.

ENVELOPE CASES, from 20s. to £10.

EMPTY TRAVELLING BAGS.

JOHN JOSEPH MECHE, 112 Regent Street, W.

FANCY GILT GOODS, from 10s. to 10 Guineas.

All the most Modern Styles.

JOHN JOSEPH MECHE, 112 Regent Street.

FIRST-CLASS TABLE CUTLERY.

FLOWER STANDS and VASES in great Variety.

GENTLEMEN'S DRESSING CASES, from 18s. to £150.

GOLD PENS.

IVORY HAIR, TOOTH, and NAIL BRUSHES.

JEWEL CASES, from 7s. to £10.

J. J. MECHE, 112 REGENT STREET.

LADIES' ELEGANT WRITING DESKS.

LADIES' WORK BASKETS, in Variety.

Empty, from 8s. 6d. to 50s.; with Fittings, from 15s. 6d. to £2.

JOHN JOSEPH MECHE, 112 Regent Street.

A few superior WORK TABLES in Papier-mâché; Solid Ivory INSTRUMENT CASES, of choice quality, from 4 to 10 Guineas.

LADIES' BOOK BOXES, from 17s. 6d. to 50s.

LADIES' DRESSING CASES, from 30s. to £500.

LETTER BALANCES, from 8s. 6d. to £7.

Various Styles, and Mordan's Patent.

JOHN JOSEPH MECHE, 112 Regent Street.

MORDAN'S PENCIL CASES, in GOLD, SILVER, and IVORY.

MECHE'S MAGIC STROP and PASTE.

Invented in 1827. Sold by Perfumers in Town and Country.

MECHE'S EASY SHAVING RAZORS.

MECHE'S SHILLING RAZORS.

MECHE'S SHILLING SCISSORS.

MECHE'S SHILLING PENKNIVES.

NO. 112 REGENT STREET, near the Quadrant.

ORNAMENTAL TABLE INK-STANDS, from 6s. to £20, very Modern Patterns.

ORNAMENTAL ORMOLU CANDLE-STICKS, from 12s. to £5 15s. per Pair.

PAPER KNIVES, from 6d. to £3.

JOHN JOSEPH MECHE, 112 Regent Street, W.

PAPIER-MÂCHÉ WORK-TABLES, £7 10s., £15, and £22.

JOHN JOSEPH MECHE, 112 Regent Street.

PEN TRAYS, from 5s. to £2.

PHOTOGRAPHIC ALBUMS, 5s. to £12.

PLATED DESSERT KNIVES.—Some Cases of highly-finished DESSERT KNIVES, in Steel and Ivory.

JOHN JOSEPH MECHE, 112 Regent Street.

PORTABLE PIC-NIC CASES.

POCKET BOOKS, from 5s. 6d. to £5.

PURSES, in Variety, from 2s. to £1.

RAZORS SET and STROPS RE-PAIRED.

RETICULE BAGS, from 6s. to £5.

SOME SPLENDID NOVELTIES.—WEDGWOOD CAMERONS on Cornish Wood, ENVELOPE CASES, BLOTTERS, BOOK SLIDES, and INKSTANDS.

JOHN JOSEPH MECHE, 112 Regent Street.

SPORTING and ANGLING KNIVES, from 4s. 6d. to £7.

STUDENT'S and WRITING CASES, from 8s. 6d. to £15.

SCOTCH ORNAMENTAL WORK.—NEEDLE CASES and NEEDLE BOXES, COTTON BOXES, PINCUSHIONS, MATCH BOXES, CARD CASES, LADIES' COMPANIONS.

SMELLING BOTTLES, from 4s. 6d. to £10.

TEA CADDIES and CHESTS, from 10s. 6d. to £12 10s.

TEA TRAYS, in Sets of Three, from £3 10s. to £50. Single Trays if required.

JOHN JOSEPH MECHE, 112 Regent Street.

TRAVELLING DRESSING-BAGS, from 42s. to £150.

TORTOISESHELL DRESSING COMBS.

TABLE and LIBRARY INKSTANDS in great Variety.

THE STAUNTON CHESSMEN.

WRITING DESKS, in Mahogany and Rosewood.

WRITING TABLE SETS, in Ormolu, Algerian Marble, and Fancy Woods, richly mounted and Plain, suitable for Presents, from £4 to £30.

WEDDING PRESENTS in rich Variety.

JOHN JOSEPH MECHE, 112 Regent Street, W.

MECHE'S BIRTHDAY GIFTS.

SATURDAY
REVIEW

JOHN JOSEPH MECHE, 112 REGENT STREET, LONDON, W.

N.B.—MR. MECHE ATTENDS PERSONALLY DAILY (ASSISTED BY HIS SON).



Printed by GEORGE ANDREW SPOTTISWOODE, at No. 5 New-street Square, in the Parish of St. Bride, in the City of London; and Published by DAVID JONES, at the Office, No. 38 Southampton Street, Strand, in the Parish of St. Paul, Covent Garden, in the County of Middlesex.—Saturday, March 12, 1870.